

# Grapevine

SINCE  
1958

28th  
YEAR

Number 326

March 1986

Page 2047

## TIMELY DATA CIRCULATED WHILE CURRENT

Reports on state tax legislation; state appropriations for universities, colleges,  
and community colleges; legislation affecting education beyond the high school.

### IN THIS ISSUE

THIRTY-SIX MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITIES, EACH RECEIVING  
MORE THAN \$100,000,000 OF STATE TAX FUNDS,  
ARE DISTINGUISHED FROM CONSOLIDATED SYSTEMS. . .2047-2049

COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN 43 STATES RECEIVE OVER \$4.7 BILLION  
OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES IN  
FISCAL YEAR 1986 . . . . .2050-2052

\* \* \* \* \*

### MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITIES AND CONSOLIDATED SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

As has been the custom in Grapevine, we briefly focus on a grouping of multi-campus universities and on a grouping of consolidated systems of higher education. Multi-campus universities are found in this issue and consolidated systems will appear in the April Grapevine. These 68 institutional groupings include approximately two-thirds of all of the state tax funds appropriated for the operating expenses of higher education nationwide.

A brief explanation will distinguish between multi-campus universities and consolidated systems of higher education. Multi-campus universities usually have, as their primary campus, the oldest and, perhaps, the largest state university in the grouping. With the more recent expansion of other state universities and colleges, the matter of campus size may vary. However, the oldest and most senior institution will likely be a primary or, if you will, a "home" campus. Another organizational feature common to multi-campus universities is their having branch or regional campuses (either two-year or four-year) located at distances from the main campus. In their seminal work on this topic, The Multicampus University, Lee and Bowen noted that a "coexistence of geographically distinct communities defines the multicampus university." Finally, a particularly distinguishing feature of multi-campus universities is their having all of the campuses, primary and branch or regional alike, under the governance of the original board. The University of California, which at one time had its main campus at Berkeley, has grown to a grouping of nine campuses, all of which are under a single governing board, the University of California Board of Regents.

(continued on page 2048)

Multi-Campus Universities (continued from page 2047)

Consolidated systems, on the other hand, include campuses which existed before the formation of the system. These pre-existing campuses may be located at distances from one another. Each of the campuses is administered as a separate entity, but the organizational feature distinctive of consolidated systems is that the system has a single governing board, not linked with the primary campus, as in the multi-campus universities. Indeed, the governing board may be located in a place apart from the campuses under its jurisdiction, such as the state capital.

Another issue often entangled with consolidated systems is the issue of statewide coordination and governance of higher education. Consolidated systems may function in states having state-level coordinating boards with statutory powers in specified areas such as budget formulation, master planning, and program review. The April issue of Grapevine will feature an article by Aims McGuinness of the Education Commission of the States focusing on current trends in statewide coordination and governance. In addition to this article, there will be a table of the appropriations to these consolidated systems, arranged according to those systems having a governing board for all public institutions and those having a governing board for senior institutions with a separate agency for community colleges.

Table 47 includes 36 multi-campus universities, each receiving in excess of \$100,000,000 of state tax fund appropriations for their operating expenses. The appropriations figures displayed in the table are for state tax funds only. The total operating budget for any one of the multi-campus universities would be considerably larger in magnitude than merely the state tax appropriations because of the addition of other revenue sources in the total operating budget for a campus (such as student tuition and fees, research and grants, gifts and philanthropy, auxiliary revenue sources, state non-tax sources, and other special purpose sources).

Over \$9 billion were appropriated for FY 86 to these 36 multi-campus universities. This equals nearly one-third of the 30.7 billion dollars appropriated for all of higher education nationally for 1985-1986.

Included in the multi-campus table are universities in 29 states. There are two multi-campus universities in four states, and these include the University of Alabama and Auburn University, Indiana University and Purdue, the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University, and the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma State University. In Texas, there are four multi-campus universities: the University of Texas, Texas A&M University, the University of Houston, and Texas Tech University. These four multi-campus universities in Texas received \$1.25 billion in state tax funds for FY 86, representing nearly 57% of the state tax appropriations for higher education in Texas in this fiscal year.

Table 47. THIRTY-SIX MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITIES RECEIVING \$100,000,000 OR MORE OF STATE TAX FUND APPROPRIATIONS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES, FISCAL YEARS 1975-76, 1983-84, AND 1985-86, IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS.

Institutions	Year 1975-76	Year 1983-84	Year 1985-86	2-year gain %	10-year gain %
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
U of California	584,585	1,110,012	1,646,441	48	182
U of Texas System	300,499	805,518	785,279	-3	161
U of Illinois	218,845	391,283	461,046	18	111
U of Minnesota	149,205	295,926	344,893	17	131
Louisiana State U	99,837	278,584	329,159	18	230
U of Maryland	129,981	234,210	285,811	22	120
Texas A&M U	97,476	278,966	260,326	-7	167
Ohio State U*	118,141	212,620	250,744	18	112
Indiana U	112,021	205,005	238,998	17	113
U of Missouri	119,445	183,021	241,247	**	102
U of Alaska	52,973	218,167	235,757	8	***
U of Massachusetts	90,717	189,669	233,006	23	157
U of Michigan	120,635	183,860	232,020	26	92
U of Tennessee	85,809	173,061	221,729	28	158
U of Hawaii	95,231	181,560	208,636	15	119
U of Alabama	76,974	131,371	202,440	54	163
Rutgers, St U of NJ	82,357	150,615	195,427	30	137
U of Arkansas	65,788	123,424	181,994	47	177
U of Kentucky	75,831	163,602	177,975	9	135
Pennsylvania St U	102,708	149,368	171,638	15	67
Purdue U	78,874	139,387	165,938	19	110
U of Nebraska	76,253	150,508	165,175	10	117
Southern Illinois U	87,739	134,082	156,815	17	79
U of Connecticut	70,100	121,139	149,740	24	114
U of Colorado	52,265	135,717	148,869	10	185
U of South Carolina	49,557	107,296	137,002	28	176
Arizona State U	45,177	104,664	136,754	31	203
U of Kansas	60,614	127,674	135,655	6	124
U of Iowa	63,567	125,560	134,047	7	111
U of Oklahoma	38,483	110,395	119,743	8	211
U of Virginia	44,704	95,370	118,627	24	165
Auburn U	44,840	72,407	116,471	61	160
Oklahoma State U	26,503	103,061	111,830	9	322
U of Houston	50,270	127,824	105,683	-17	110
U of New Mexico	33,043	89,056	103,907	17	214
Texas Tech U	51,149	118,028	102,289	-13	100
Totals	3,652,196	7,522,010	9,013,111		
Weighted percentages of gain				20	147

\*Includes an estimated sum for the four branch campuses at Mansfield, Lima, Marion, and Newark

\*\*Not comparable because the FY1986 figure contains a sum for social security which was reported separately in 1984.

\*\*\*Not comparable because the FY1986 figure contains a substantial sum for student financial aid which was not reported in 1976.

Community Colleges (continued from page 2051)

Some observations can be made about these two tables and the support of community colleges. First, there is a substantial amount of state tax funds going toward the support of local as well as state community colleges. For FY 86, these amounts are in excess of three billion dollars for local state-aided community colleges and in excess of one billion dollars for state community colleges. The locally-sponsored community college is the predominant structure which has evolved in the two-year college sector over the years, thus it is not surprising that more states exhibit this local funding pattern for community colleges. The states in this local grouping include those states well-known for having large community college systems with a major share of support coming from local taxes. These include California and the other eight states in the top grouping, each of which provides in excess of \$85 million in state tax funds annually in the support of community colleges. There are fewer states with state tax funds as the primary funding source.

The second observation is to note that the percent of gain over the previous two years rose for both types of community colleges over the 13 percent of gain demonstrated one year ago for FY 85. And even this 13 percent gain was higher than the 6 percent gain for local community colleges in FY 84 but the same for state community colleges in FY 84 (13%). In FY 86 local community colleges showed a 15% two-year gain, and state colleges gained 18% over the preceding two years.

During the period from FY 84 to FY 86, there also were positive gains for all of higher education on a nationwide basis. The lowest two-year percentage of gain since 1960 occurred in FY 84 (11%), followed by two years of consecutive positive gain in state support for higher education. This same pattern is true, also, for the community/junior colleges.

---

Center for Higher Education  
College of Education  
Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61761-6901

## Grapevine

Edward Hines, Director and Editor  
M.M. Chambers, Founding Editor  
Gwen B. Pruyne, Managing Editor

Responsibility for any errors in the data, or for opinions expressed, is not to be attributed to any organization or person other than the Editors.

**GRAPEVINE** is circulated to key persons in the fifty states. Not Copyrighted.

---

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
Normal, Illinois  
Permit No. 1

---

Table 49. APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR ANNUAL OPERATING EXPENSES OF STATE COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES, FISCAL YEAR 1986 AND TWO PRIOR FISCAL YEARS, IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS.

States	Year 1983-84	Year 1984-85	Year 1985-86	2-yr gain Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Washington	189,236	189,237	198,230	5
Virginia	117,744	127,885	132,839	13
Massachusetts	90,729	108,990	123,386	36
New York*	83,120	81,664	84,304	1
Oklahoma*	66,812	62,734	71,580	7
South Carolina	62,519	70,154	84,425	35
Minnesota	51,843	53,270	61,167	18
Alabama	45,100	52,742	66,088	47
Georgia*	42,374	50,064	53,534	26
Colorado*	39,892	41,781	44,721	12
Tennessee	43,224	51,666	55,512	28
Connecticut	33,388	37,103	40,183	20
Delaware	18,659	18,891	20,070	8
Rhode Island	17,596	18,685	19,608	11
Nevada	13,083	13,948	17,412	33
Utah	11,411	12,853	14,205	24
West Virginia	8,742	9,632	10,138	16
New Mexico*	4,168	5,390	5,723	37
North Dakota	3,138	3,138	4,748	51
<b>Totals</b>	<b>942,778</b>	<b>1,009,827</b>	<b>1,107,873</b>	
<b>Weighted average percentage of gain</b>				<b>18</b>

\*One of five states having both local and state community colleges.

Community/junior colleges are an extremely important segment of American higher education, as demonstrated clearly in the two tables above. One finds these two-year institutions located in 43 of the 50 states. In the remaining seven states, there are two-year colleges including vocational-technical institutes or two-year branch campuses of universities. These are excluded from the tables above because in most instances they may not have a full or comprehensive range of academic programs.

These two tables display two separate groups of community/junior colleges. In Table 48, there are 27 states having community colleges where the primary funding sources are local taxing districts and other sources of revenue may include some state aid as well as student tuition. On the other hand, there are 19 states where financial support of community colleges comes primarily from the state with little or no local tax support (Table 49). Five states appear in both tables--Colorado, Georgia, New Mexico, New York, and Oklahoma--because they have at least one community college exemplifying each of the two patterns of support.

Table 48. APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS IN AID TO LOCAL PUBLIC COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGES FOR OPERATING EXPENSES, FISCAL 1986 AND TWO PRIOR FISCAL YEARS, IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS.

States	Year 1983-84	Year 1984-85	Year 1985-86	2-yr gain Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(4)
California	1,066,446	1,117,678	1,188,504	11
Texas	430,368	449,940	443,411	3
Florida	321,022	335,312	356,133	11
North Carolina	220,786	256,571	261,587	18
New York*	195,801	227,071	258,759	32
Illinois**	159,333	170,963	191,632	20
Michigan	144,708	159,307	175,537	21
Maryland	80,082	92,173	96,710	21
Pennsylvania	66,891	69,057	85,355	28
New Jersey	58,188	67,708	75,613	30
Ohio	55,907	59,584	68,262	22
Mississippi	47,473	50,423	60,691	28
Iowa	54,875	57,590	57,767	5
Arizona	44,620	47,758	57,410	29
Oregon	50,593	54,190	57,235	13
Missouri	39,560	43,345	50,899 <sup>+</sup>	29
Wyoming	29,023	29,023	32,979	14
Kansas	23,637	25,565	27,695	17
Nebraska	21,596	23,089	23,141	7
Arkansas	14,502	18,807	22,941	58
Indiana***	11,178	12,648	14,657	31
Colorado*	10,004	10,198	10,087	1
Georgia*	6,577	6,766	6,520	-1
Idaho	4,470	5,236	5,515	23
Montana	3,128	3,245	3,210	3
New Mexico*	764	800	907	19
Oklahoma*	485	453	508	5
Totals	3,162,017	3,394,500	3,633,665	
Weighted average percentage of gain				15

\*One of five states having both local and state community colleges.

\*\*Includes State Community College in East St. Louis which does not receive local tax support.

\*\*\*For Vincennes University, a two-year community college supported primarily by the state but partly by the county.

+Includes one time funding for computer, science and library equipment and materials.