

## MULTI-CAMPUS AND CONSOLIDATED HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Edward R. Hines

Multi-campus universities and consolidated systems of higher education are among the characteristics which distinguish American higher education from higher education systems throughout the world. Another feature is the large, vigorous private sector of higher education with private or independent colleges and universities throughout the country but especially evident in the Northeast. Still another distinctive feature of U.S. higher education is the way in which access and opportunity have been integrated into the higher education landscape, in part because of the rapid growth of community and two-year public colleges since World War II, aided by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. A final, unique characteristic of American higher education is the absence of a national university as well as an accompanying governmental ministry of education or higher education, although many would tout the U.S. Department of Education as an imposing federal bureaucracy having great influence over higher education.

**System Similarities and Differences.** Annually, *Grapevine* publishes a multi-campus table and a consolidated system table. These tables are included in this issue of *Grapevine*. It is useful to note the differences between these two entities. Similar to Lee and Bowen's "flagship systems" (1971 & 1975), *Grapevine* operationally defines multi-campus universities as those entities having the largest or perhaps oldest campus as the primary or main campus; the University of California at Berkeley is an illustrative example, as would be the University of Texas at Austin, the Champaign-Urbana campus of the University of Illinois, or the Twin Cities campuses of the University of Minnesota with a campus in Minneapolis and a campus in St. Paul. All the research universities in the "Big Ten" grouping, which now includes Pennsylvania State University as the "11th" university in the Big Ten, are included in this multi-campus university table, save Michigan State University and Northwestern University. Michigan State University is omitted because it has a single campus; Northwestern is a private university which does not receive a direct appropriation of \$100,000,000 or more. In addition to the primary or main campus, the "other campuses" (or units) may be four-year universities, such as the University of Michigan at Flint; two-year colleges, such as Pennsylvania State University at Johnstown; or a medical campus such as the University of Illinois Medical School at Peoria, Rockford or Chicago. A third characteristic of multi-campus universities is that each has a single governing board, and that board may be located on or may be associated closely with the main campus.

---

### GRAPEVINE

Edward R. Hines, Editor

M. M. Chambers, Founding Editor

Gwen B. Pruyn, Managing Editor

Responsibility for 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.

Consolidated systems of higher education have individual campuses, like multi-campus universities, but these individual campuses may include those which existed prior to the system's having been formulated. Both "older" and "newer" campuses may be included in consolidated systems of higher education. Each of these campuses, especially the older campuses, probably had been administered separately before the consolidated system was created. In addition, these individual campuses often are located at considerable distances from each other. Trying to force geographic proximity on the broad structure of a consolidated system of higher education is unworkable! Like multi-campus universities, consolidated systems of higher education have a single governing board. The consolidated governing board, however, might be located in the state capital, rather than at the main campus. The consolidated governing board may have been created long after some of the campuses were founded.

With these definitions in mind, we can examine the two tables that follow. There are seven examples of overlap, where multi-campus universities are a part of a larger consolidated system of higher education. These entities are shown below:

<u>Multi-Campus Universities - Part of - Consolidated Systems</u>	
Arizona State U	Arizona Board of Regents
University of Iowa	Iowa Board of Regents
University of Kansas	Kansas Board of Regents
University of Massachusetts	Board of Regents of Higher Ed
University of Mississippi	Institutions of Higher Learning
West Virginia University	State University System
University of Wisconsin	U of Wisconsin System

This year, there were 43 multi-campus universities and 31 consolidated systems of higher education in the two tables. This number is slightly larger than the numbers reported a year ago, (39 multi-campus and 29 consolidated systems, respectively) because a cutoff figure of \$100,000,000 was chosen to delimit the table. Only entities whose operating budgets were larger than \$100 million for Fiscal Year 1994 were included in these two tables.

**Multi-Campus Universities.** The 43 multi-campus universities were allocated over \$12.7 billion of the \$40.8 billion appropriated to higher education by state governments in Fiscal Year 1994. This amount of \$12.7 billion represented 31.1 percent of the funds appropriated nationally to higher education.

As the table on page 3201 shows, only the University of California and the University of Texas garnered more than one billion dollars each in operating funds. The University of Illinois was allocated about half of that amount (\$587,000,000), and the remainder of the multi-campus universities were allocated less than one half billion dollars each. Nineteen of the multi-campus universities were allocated less than \$200,000,000 each.

Of the 43 multi-campus universities, there were 16 entities (37.2% of the total) which actually suffered a *decline* in current dollars (including a zero percent change) over the most recent two years. Of these 16 multi-campus universities, the greatest loss by far was experienced by the University of California which had a 15 percentage decline over two years. The University of South Carolina had a nine percent two-year loss, and Louisiana State and Pennsylvania State Universities had two-year losses of five and four percent, respectively. The other twelve universities had losses of three percent or less over two years.

MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITIES WHICH RECEIVED \$100,000,000 OR MORE OF STATE TAX FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR OPERATING EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1983-84, 1991-92 AND 1993-94, WITH PERCENTAGES OF GAIN OVER THE MOST RECENT TWO AND TEN YEARS.  
(In thousands of dollars)

Institutions	Year 1983-84	Year 1991-92	Year 1993-94	2-Yr Gain Percent	10-Yr Gain Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
U of California	1,108,394*	2,105,560	1,794,152	- 15	62
U of Texas	826,347	979,574	1,135,690	16	37
U of Illinois	391,283	576,503	587,184	2	50
U of Minnesota	294,948	449,639	447,792	0	52
Texas A&M U	322,008	383,974	435,626	13	35
U of Wisconsin**	255,044	358,228	384,196	7	51
U of Hawaii	180,510	340,296	371,336	9	106
Indiana University	207,477	344,339	349,490	1	68
U of Massachusetts	***	238,621	329,763	***	***
Ohio State U+	208,063	317,838	314,799	- 1	51
U of Tennessee	173,142	275,002	314,495	14	82
U of Michigan	183,859	308,445	308,712	0	68
U of Alabama	131,371	282,483	306,952	9	134
U of Missouri	180,278	289,351	298,638	3	66
Louisiana State U	278,654	314,354	297,132	- 5	7
U of Nebraska	158,190	281,705	296,168	5	87
U of Kentucky	163,602	288,135	284,704	- 1	74
U of Washington	166,962	264,854	256,041	- 3	53
Rutgers, St U of NJ++	143,553*	248,977	253,200	2	76
Pennsylvania State U++	149,368	258,679	249,153	- 4	67
Purdue University	139,387	243,828	243,286	0	75
U of Arkansas	123,424	218,679	232,651	6	88
Arizona State U	102,551	205,026	213,967	4	109
U of Iowa	125,560	183,985	205,083	11	63
U of Connecticut++	121,139	180,912	185,521	3	53
Southern Illinois U	134,082	181,921	183,007	1	36
U of Kansas+++	127,674	162,995	173,158	6	36
U of Alaska	158,132	168,160	171,207	2	8
Auburn University	72,407	154,556	166,800	8	130
U of Colorado	135,717	154,145	162,943	6	20
U of New Mexico	89,056	143,240	157,459	10	77
U of South Carolina	107,296	170,384	154,997	- 9	44
U of Houston	127,824	143,516	153,963	7	20
West Virginia U	95,298	145,223	152,027	5	60
Oklahoma State U	109,476	150,046	148,645	- 1	36
U of Oklahoma	110,395	149,501	148,106	- 1	34
Washington State U	99,072	149,416	147,026	- 2	48
U of Cincinnati	89,452	137,558	138,174	0	54
U of Pittsburgh++	81,444	139,960	135,085	- 3	66
U of Mississippi+++	83,335	98,441	114,774	17	38
U of Virginia#	76,055	105,861	103,334	- 2	36
New Mexico State U	59,012	90,902	102,665	13	74
U of North Texas	73,520	97,148	101,092	4	38
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,964,361</b>	<b>12,481,960</b>	<b>12,710,193</b>		
<b>Weighted averages percentages of gain</b>				<b>2</b>	<b>60</b>

\*Does not reflect subsequent revisions.

\*\*Includes only the doctoral cluster with campuses at Madison and Milwaukee.

\*\*\*Figure for FY1983-84 is not available. For FY1993-94, Not comparable because appropriations contained significant amounts from sources which were not included in former years.

(Footnotes continued on the reverse side)

THIRTY-ONE CONSOLIDATED SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, EACH RECEIVING \$100,000,000 OR MORE OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES, FISCAL YEARS 1983-84, 1991-92, AND 1993-94, WITH PERCENTAGES OF GAIN OVER THE MOST RECENT TWO AND TEN YEARS. (In thousands of dollars)

System	Year 1983-84	Year 1991-92	Year 1993-94	2yr gain Percent	10yr gain Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
NY State U of NY	1,069,644	1,245,182	1,251,299	0	17
CA California State U	949,981*	1,645,250	1,483,244	- 10	56
NC U of North Carolina	641,177	1,103,342	1,206,940	9	88
GA U System of Georgia	570,170	874,320	1,034,858	18	81
FL State U System	614,711	896,964	971,217	8	58
MA Board of Regents	537,263	583,569	826,995	**	**
WI U of Wisconsin System	495,999	702,434	757,369	8	53
NY City U of New York	401,365	617,159	594,626	- 4	48
AZ Board of Regents	288,577	523,266	540,509	3	87
MD U of Maryland	235,562	524,301	522,933	0	122
IA Board of Regents	276,244	416,370	472,125	13	71
TN Bd of Regents System	224,251	366,167	443,095	21	98
KS Board of Regents	279,048	399,935	421,002	5	51
PA St System of Higher Ed	235,053	373,625	364,914	- 2	55
UT Board of Regents	198,995	327,723	363,668	11	83
OR System of High Ed	212,987	350,124	325,317	- 7	53
MS Insts of High Learning	256,418	280,972	320,523	14	25
LA Bd of Trustees System	174,725	218,534	214,341	- 2	23
WV State U System	127,084	205,851	214,031	4	68
ID Board of Education	101,107	195,334	201,334	3	99
NV U of Nevada System	75,360	191,773	194,219	1	158
IL Board of Regents	126,675	174,887	176,223	1	39
MN State U System	101,199	183,134	175,399	- 4	73
IL Board of Governors	115,042	155,565	159,002	2	38
ND Board of Higher Ed	110,534	145,536	143,699	- 1	30
ME U of Maine System	58,972	133,507	132,726	- 1	125
MT Montana U System	100,489	126,562	112,771	- 11	12
CO State Bd of Agriculture	68,843	103,751	109,055	5	58
RI Bd of Governors for H Ed	88,516	106,166	112,358	6	27
TX State University System	80,228	93,725	103,449	10	29
SD Board of Regents	58,096	91,579	102,369	12	76
<b>Totals</b>	<b>8,874,315</b>	<b>13,356,607</b>	<b>14,051,610</b>		
<b>Weighted averages percentages of gain</b>				<b>5</b>	<b>58</b>

\*Does not reflect subsequent revisions.

\*\*Not comparable because the FY1993-94 figures contained significant amounts from sources which were not included in former years.

Footnotes continued from preceding page

+An estimated sum has been added to each figure for the branch campuses at Mansfield, Lima, Marion and Newark.

++The figures for all three fiscal years do not include some amounts reported as a lump sum, including one or more of the following: salary increases, fringe benefits, collective bargaining or interdepartmental transfers.

+++Includes the medical school which is not located on the main campus.

#Includes the Clinch Valley branch campus, but does not include the medical school.

More positively, seven multi-campus universities had two-year gains *in excess of 10 percent*. These included the University of Mississippi (17%), the University of Texas (16%), the University of Tennessee (14%), Texas A&M and New Mexico State University (13%), the University of Iowa (11%), and the University of New Mexico (10%).

The 10-year gains included four universities with gains in excess of 100%. The University of Alabama and Auburn University had more than a 130% ten-year gain. The University of Hawaii and Arizona State University had 10-year gains of slightly more than 100%.

All of the other multi-campus universities had 10-year gains of less than 100%. The smallest 10-year gains were experienced by Louisiana State University (7%) and the University of Alaska (8%). The Universities of Colorado and Houston each had 20% 10-year gains. There were a number of multi-campus universities which clustered in the 30%-39% 10-year gain category, including the University of Texas (37%); Texas A&M University (35%); Southern Illinois University, the University of Kansas, and Oklahoma State University (36%); the University of Oklahoma (34%); and the Universities of Mississippi and North Texas (38%).

**Consolidated Higher Education Systems.** There were 31 consolidated systems of higher education receiving more than \$100 million in state tax funds this year, as shown in the table on page 3202. In total, these consolidated systems received \$14 billion of state tax funds which represented 34.3% of the national total appropriated to higher education by state governments. Four of these systems, SUNY, Cal State, North Carolina, and Georgia, each received more than one billion dollars. Consolidated systems in Florida, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, New York (CUNY), Arizona, and Maryland each received between one-half and one billion dollars. The remainder of the consolidated systems of higher education received less than \$500 million for Fiscal Year 1994.

Eleven of the consolidated systems received zero percent gain or a percentage *loss over two years*. These included consolidated systems in Montana and California at a two-year loss of 10% or more, Oregon (-7), Minnesota and City University of New York (-4), Pennsylvania and Louisiana systems (-2), and North Dakota and Maine (-1).

On the positive side, there were six consolidated systems of higher education which had two-year gains of 10% or more. These included Tennessee (21%), Georgia (18%), Mississippi (14%), Iowa (13%), Utah (11%), and Texas (10%).

COMPARISONS OF TWO-YEAR PERCENTAGES OF GAIN FOR  
CONSOLIDATED SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITIES  
AND NATIONWIDE, FOR THE MOST RECENT TEN YEARS

<u>Fiscal Years</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>	<u>1987</u>	<u>1988</u>	<u>1989</u>	<u>1990</u>	<u>1991</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>1993</u>	<u>1994</u>
Consolidated	16	20	16	14	12	13	7	- 3	- 1	5
Multi-campus	17	20	12	9	12	15	12	4	- 1	2
Nationwide	16	19	13	12	14	14	12	3	- 1	2

Note: These figures do not take into account revisions which may have occurred after they were originally reported.

**Ten-Year Trend.** In total, multi-campus universities and consolidated higher education systems received \$26.7 billion in Fiscal Year 1994, which represented 65.5% of the total amount appropriated to higher education in the nation. Grapevine has been tracking trends over time for multi-campus universities and consolidated systems of higher education, and these are shown in the table on the preceding page. From Fiscal Year 1985 through 1994, multi-campus universities had larger two-year percentage gains in four of the 10 years (1985, 1990, 1991, and 1992). Consolidated systems had greater two-year percentage gains in 1987, 1988, and 1994. There were ties in 1986, 1989, and 1993. The largest *differences* in two-year percentage gains (seven percentage points) occurred in 1992, and a five percentage point difference occurred in 1988 and again in 1991. There was a four percentage points difference in 1987 and a three percentage points differences in the current year.

These percentage differences, however, need to take into account other factors. Foremost among these factors is the use by Grapevine of calculating weighted average percentages of gain, rather than simple arithmetic averages or mean scores. The reason for the use of weighted averages is because the entire country becomes the unit of analysis, not simply a collection of states as the unit of analysis. Calculating mean scores for groups of states gives equal recognition or weighting to each state. This does not seem advisable, given the large differences in magnitude in higher education systems between the so-called "megastates" and the smaller states. A primary example occurs currently in California, because of the protracted fiscal difficulty being experienced there. When a weighted percentage of gain is calculated for the nation, the influence of California is considerable. This occurred in Fiscal Year 1994 in both the multi-campus universities (the University of California), and in the consolidated higher education systems (California State University). The former's 15% decline and the latter's 10% decline had negative effects on the total.

The magnitude of the two-year loss in the University of California was substantial (-15%). Therefore, the weighted average percentage of gain was five percent for consolidated systems, but only two percent for multi-campus universities. Using mean scores, rather than weighted average percentages of gain, consolidated systems gained 3.8% over two years, while multi-campus universities gained 3.3% over two years. The similarities are far greater than the differences when using mean scores. Over 10 years, there are similarities using either mean scores or weighted percentages. Using mean scores, the 10-year gain for consolidated systems was 63.4%, and the 10-year percentage gain for multi-campus universities was 58.8%. Using weighted averages, there were 10-year gains of 58% for consolidated systems and 60% for multi-campus universities.

## ***Grapevine***

Center for Higher Education  
Illinois State University  
5900 EAF  
Normal, IL 61790-5900

Address correction requested

NON-PROFIT ORG  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
ILLINOIS STATE  
UNIVERSITY