

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 692

HE 004 728

AUTHOR Millett, John D.
TITLE Confronting the New Depression in Higher Education.
Two Budget Exercises.
INSTITUTION Academy for Educational Development, Inc.,
Washington, D. C. Management Div.
PUB DATE Oct 73
NOTE 70p.
AVAILABLE FROM Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1424 16th
Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (single copies
free)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Colleges; *Educational Administration; Educational
Finance; *Educational Planning; Financial Policy;
Financial Problems; *Higher Education; *Management;
*Universities

ABSTRACT

This document presents two budget exercises for educational administrators to provide means for the improvement of management and planning efforts in higher education institutions. The examples, Principal College and Major University, are fictional institutions, but their statistical data and problems will be easily recognizable as being close to those of many colleges and universities in the United States. Principal College, representing a small liberal arts college, and Major University, representing a large research university both have serious financial problems. The problem for the president of both institutions is to reduce the expenditures authorized for the coming year along with the related auxiliary problems associated with cutbacks. The author presents objectives and programs, financial statistics, instructional procedures, expenditure analysis, admissions policies, research enrollment, and governance of each institution. The solution of each institution's problems is left with the reader. (PG)

ED 082629

University of South Carolina
Division of Student Affairs

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Subject: Analysis of Students Committing Major Discipline Offenses During the 10-Year Period 1963-1973 by State of Residence

Research Notes No. 18-73

September 25, 1973

Principal Researchers: Dr. Paul P. Fidler
Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs

Miss Julianne Still
Graduate Research Assistant

Mr. Robert C. Smith, Jr.
Graduate Research Assistant

HE004654

DIVISION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

Research Note
No. 18-73

September, 1973

Subject: Analysis of Students Committing Major Discipline Offenses During the
10-Year Period 1963-1973 by State of Residence.

Background and Purpose:

This study updates to July 1, 1973, the analysis of a previous Research Note (No. 4-69) which dealt with 205 male students against whom disciplinary action was taken by the University's Discipline Committee for offenses occurring in the 5-year period from July 1, 1963 to June 30, 1968.

Research Note 4-69 offered the following conclusions:

1. Out-of-state students committed major offenses¹ in greater numbers than would be expected on the basis of chance alone;
2. Out-of-state students from the Middle Atlantic States were more likely to commit offenses than those from the Southern States; and
3. A greater proportion of out-of-state offenders were freshmen and had graduated in the lower half of their high school class than did in-state offenders.

¹Major offenses are those handled by the University Discipline Committee. Although the nature of offenses committed by students appearing before the Committee has changed somewhat over the years, the following types are chief among those considered as "major": malicious vandalism; possession or use of firearms; arson; theft, forgery or fraud; possession or sale of illegal drugs; and assault.

I. Residence: In-State vs. Out-of-State

The distribution of major discipline cases by state residency during the ten-year period studied is as follows:

Table 1

A Comparison of U.S.C. Males Involved in Major Discipline Cases by State Residency, 1963 - 73

	<u>In-State Males</u>			<u>Out-of-State Males</u>			<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>DISCIPLINE SAMPLE</u>		<u>PCT. OF IN-STATE MALES IN TOTAL UNDER-GRADUATE MALE POPULATION</u>	<u>DISCIPLINE SAMPLE</u>		<u>PCT. OF OUT-OF-STATE MALES IN TOTAL UNDER-GRADUATE MALE POPULATION³</u>	
	<u>NO.</u>	<u>PCT.</u>		<u>NO.</u>	<u>PCT.</u>		
1963-64	27	65.9	80.6	14	34.1*	19.4	41
1964-65	31	75.6	79.6	10	24.4	20.4	41
1965-66	28	73.7	77.4	10	26.3	22.6	38
1966-67	29	67.4	78.5	14	32.6*	21.5	43
1967-68	11	28.2*	79.3	28	71.8*	20.3	39
1968-69	15	55.6	79.7	12	44.4*	20.3	27
1969-70	21	62.8	80.0	13	38.4*	20.0	34
1970-71	7	43.7	80.4	9	56.3*	19.6	16
1971-72	19	76.0	81.3	6	24.0	18.7	25
1972-73	5	55.6	81.6	4	44.4*	18.4	9
Total	<u>193</u>	<u>61.7</u>	<u> </u>	<u>120</u>	<u>38.3</u>	<u> </u>	<u>313</u> ⁴

* $\alpha < .001$

³These percentages were supplied by the U.S.C. Office of Institutional Research. The figures for 1963-1966 are estimates based on trend lines and other available data.

⁴Residence data were not available for three members of the sample.

The current analysis examines all offenses committed during the 10-year period by state of residence. In addition to providing a descriptive analysis of the students involved, comparisons are made with the total undergraduate population at U.S.C. to determine if state residency is a factor in characterizing students who commit major disciplinary offenses.

Delimitations:

The sample consists of the 346 students who appeared before the University Discipline Committee for major disciplinary offenses and were not adjudged innocent during the period July 1, 1963 to June 30, 1973.² Students who appeared before the Committee to petition for admission, readmission, or to appeal lower level decisions are not included in this study. Of the students in the original sample, 316 or 91.3% were males. In view of the small number of females involved, the following analyses are restricted to the male sample (N=313).

²Since the students were disciplined by the Board of Trustees, and not the University Discipline Committee, this study specifically excludes those students who were disciplined or suspended from the University in the spring and summer of 1970 for offenses relating to the sit-ins and demonstrations in the Russell House and Administration Building. Such offenses occurred as part of the nationwide student reaction to the invasion of Cambodia and the Kent State student deaths.

The proportion of out-of-state students committing offenses was significantly higher for 7 of the past 10 years than one would expect on the basis of chance alone. Levels of significance were determined through the comparison of sample percents to population percents. Approximately 39.7% of the offenses during 1963-73 were committed by out-of-state students. Major deviations of this trend occurred during 1967-68 as nearly 72% of all cases involved out-of-state students, and to a lesser extent in 1970-71 when 56.3% of all cases involved non-residents.

In order to contrast the percentage of out-of-state students committing offenses with the out-of-state students enrolled in the total male undergraduate population, it should be noted that never in the period of 1963-73 has the percentage of out-of-state students in the total male undergraduate population exceeded 23% (see Table 1). In fact, this percentage has constantly decreased since 1965 and in 1972 had dropped to 18.4%.

II. Residence: Region

The 120 out-of-state students who appeared before the Discipline Committee were examined as to their region of residence. Seventy-eight or 65% of the students were from the Middle Atlantic area represented by the following states: New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. In contrast, during the Fall Semester, 1972, these states comprised only 37.2% of the male out-of-state student population at U.S.C. Twenty-five or approximately 21% of the 120 out-of-state students were from the southern states of North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee, Virginia, Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. These states, however, provided 41.5% of the male out-of-state student population in September, 1972. It is apparent from these data that out-of-state students from the Middle Atlantic States committed more major discipline offenses than those from Southern States when the relative percentage of all male students enrolled at U.S.C. from these regions is considered.

III. Classification

Available data for Fall Semesters, 1968-72 show that for each year between 29.9 and 39.9% of undergraduate males were freshmen.⁵ In the discipline sample, 55.9% of the cases were committed by freshmen. The percentage of male freshmen among out-of-state cases was 59.5%. The corresponding figure for in-state students was 53.1%. During the 10-year period, approximately 80% of the in-state males and 85% of the out-of-state males were sophomores or freshmen. The distribution of discipline cases by classification was as follows:

Table 2

Comparison of U.S.C. Males Involved in Major Discipline Cases by Classification, 1963-73

	In-State Males		Out-of-State Males	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>
Freshmen	103	53.1	72	59.5
Sophomores	50	25.8	30	24.8
Juniors	28	14.4	13	10.7
Seniors	13	6.7	6	5.0

IV. Rank in Class

Data on all of the entering U.S.C. male freshmen for the Fall Semester, 1963-72 indicated that fewer than 30% of the male students were in the lower half of their respective high school graduating classes. The percentage of in-state students in the discipline sample who graduated in the lower half of their high school class was 37.9%, while the corresponding percentage for the out-of-state students was 72.0%. Rank in class data were available for 153 of the 195 (78%) in-state students and 107 of the 121 (88%) out-of-state students.

⁵In the fall of 1968, 34.5% of all undergraduate males were freshmen, in subsequent years, the corresponding figures were: 1969, 39.9%; 1970, 34.6%; 1971, 29.9%; 1972, 32.7%.

The number of cases by rank in class was as follows:

Table 3

A Comparison of U.S.C. Males Involved in Major Discipline Cases by Rank in Their High School Classes, 1963-1973

Quartile	In-State Males		Out-of-State Males	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Pct.</u>
1	43	28.1	10	9.3
2	52	34.0	20	18.7
3	30	19.6	45	42.1
4	28	18.3	32	29.9
	—		—	
	153		107	

Conclusions:

The findings of this study reveal that state residency was shown to be a factor in describing male students who committed major disciplinary offenses during the 10-year period 1963-1973. It was found that:

1. Out-of-state students have continued to commit major offenses in greater numbers than would be expected based on the percentage of these students in the total male undergraduate population.
2. Out-of-state students from the Middle Atlantic States committed a greater amount of major discipline offenses than those from the Southern States, based on the relative percentage of all undergraduate male students enrolled at U.S.C. from these regions.
3. Over half of both out-of-state and in-state offenders were freshmen (59.5% and 53.1% respectively).
4. Out-of-state offenders graduated almost twice as often in the lower half of their high school classes as compared to their in-state counterparts⁶ (72% and 37.9%, respectively).

⁶This disproportionate finding is valid not only for the total 10-year period, but was consistent throughout the 10-year period.

Recommendations:

The total number of major discipline cases (which is declining, except for drug use) occurring among students is still a continuing concern of the Division of Student Affairs. Following (but not necessarily as a result of) publication of Research Note #4 (Analysis of Students Committing Major Discipline Offenses by State of Residence, 1963-1968), admission policies at the University of South Carolina have been modified to make admissions requirements more stringent for out-of-state students who graduated in the lower half of their respective high school classes. Prior to that time, entrance requirements were the same for both in-state and out-of-state students.

The current data confirm the conclusions of the 1969 analysis and show that out-of-state students continue to be involved in discipline cases to a greater extent than expected. Therefore, it is recommended that:

1. Admission policies relating to out-of-state male students should be periodically reviewed, particularly at the freshman level.
2. The incidence of major discipline offenses by out-of-state students should be a matter of continued observation.
3. State of residence should be considered a research variable in other student studies.