

IN THIS ISSUE

APPROPRIATIONS TO MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITIES AND CONSOLIDATED SYSTEMS by J. Russell Higham. . . . . 3249-3253

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

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Consolidated	16	20	16	14	12	13	7	- 3	- 1	5	12
Multi-campus	17	20	12	9	12	15	12	4	- 1	2	6
Nationwide	16	19	13	12	14	14	12	3	- 1	2	8

\*These percentages do not reflect subsequent revisions to the appropriations data; however, those revisions would not significantly change the percentages reported in previous Grapevines related to these segments of higher education.

In FY1994-95, consolidated systems of higher education and multi-campus universities cumulatively received \$28.2 billion in state tax funds. This amount represented 65.9% of the nation's total tax funds appropriated to higher education. This "percent of total" represented a one-half percent gain over FY1993-94 in magnitude of dollars. More importantly, in FY1994-95 each of these systems realized at least two-fold increases in the positive growth trends previously established in their respective categories during FY1993-94. These positive changes can be considered to be definite fiscal rebounds from the deficit percentage changes experienced in FY1992-93, just two years ago.

For the second consecutive year, the collective 31 consolidated systems outgained the 43 multi-campus universities in two-year percentage gains comparisons. Overall, this total fiscal picture of improvement is not of the extent noted in the late 1980s and early 1990s, but it is a welcome turnaround when compared with the past three fiscal years.

\*\*\*\*\*

AVAILABLE NOW

State Higher Education Appropriations  
 Order from: State Higher Education Executive Officers  
 707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202-3427  
 Tel:303-299-3686 Fax:303-296-8332  
 \$15.00 prepayment preferred

\*\*\*\*\*

GRAPEVINE

Edward R. Hines, Editor

M. M. Chambers, Founding Editor

Gwen B. Pruyne, 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.

MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITIES WHICH RECEIVED \$100,000,000 OR MORE OF STATE TAX FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR OPERATING EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1984-85, 1992-93 AND 1994-95, WITH PERCENTAGES OF GAIN OVER THE MOST RECENT TWO AND TEN YEARS.  
(In thousands of dollars)

Institutions	Year 1984-85	Year 1992-93	Year 1994-95	2-Yr Gain Percent	10-Yr Gain Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
U of California	1,457,147	1,878,531	1,831,704	- 2	26
U of Texas	897,162	988,141	1,122,929	14	25
U of Illinois	418,365	576,074	613,680	7	47
U of Minnesota	305,562	438,216	462,187	5	51
Texas A&M U	313,863	389,120	433,243	11	38
U of Wisconsin*	265,163	376,137	402,307	7	52
U of Hawaii	185,143	367,430	386,023	5	108
Indiana University	221,242	342,356	348,850	2	58
U of Massachusetts	211,884	221,129	343,393	N/C	N/C
U of Alabama	162,962	285,080	342,298	20	110
U of Tennessee	204,602	299,807	335,952	12	64
U of Missouri	200,007	289,351	335,174	16	68
U of Michigan	182,113	309,127	316,981	3	74
Ohio State U**	220,442	293,019	315,664	8	43
Louisiana State U	315,195	300,398	312,186	4	- 1
U of Nebraska	163,897	292,411	305,587	5	86
U of Kentucky	168,506	274,856	295,481	8	75
Pennsylvania State U***	162,700	249,204	259,219	4	59
Rutgers, St U of NJ***	172,815	250,518	254,819	2	47
U of Washington	166,962	273,008	250,412	- 8	50
Purdue University	150,421	240,682	242,357	1	61
U of Arkansas	153,536	232,499	234,284	1	53
Arizona State U	118,716	208,554	232,652	12	96
U of Iowa	137,303	198,456	211,304	6	54
U of Connecticut***	137,603	171,784	188,995	10	37
Southern Illinois U	140,655	176,501	187,620	6	33
Auburn University	91,314	155,280	185,924	20	104
U of Kansas+	136,594	169,533	180,669	7	32
U of New Mexico	100,731	147,724	171,976	16	71
U of Alaska	168,307	166,041	169,310	2	1
U South Carolina	122,007	162,512	166,063	2	36
U of Colorado	141,637	169,137	155,607	- 8	10
West Virginia U	102,642	145,223	155,292	7	51
U of Mississippi+	80,305	107,067	153,673	44	91
U of Houston	130,242	145,401	151,898	4	17
Oklahoma State U	102,826	154,003	147,980	- 4	44
U of Oklahoma	103,607	153,446	147,396	- 4	42
Washington State U	99,072	155,097	144,575	- 7	46
U of Cincinnati	100,819	134,260	144,573	8	43
U of Pittsburgh***	89,732	135,073	139,841	4	56
New Mexico State U	68,346	95,325	111,561	17	63
U of Virginia	83,474	102,482	105,478	3	26
U of North Texas	73,634	97,641	101,606	4	38
Totals	9,029,255	12,317,634	13,098,723		
Weighted averages percentages of gain				6	45

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

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

\*\*\*The figures for some fiscal years do not include amounts reported as a lump sum, such as salary increases, fringe benefits, collective bargaining or interdepartmental transfers.

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

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

By J. Russell ("Rusty") Higham, III\*

One of the many features presented annually by Grapevine is the compilation of individual state's tax appropriations to the nation's multi-campus universities and consolidated systems of higher education. The appropriations for operating expenses of these two segments of the state-supported higher education enterprise are reported on the adjacent two pages. Two- and ten-year percentages of gain are also shown in the two tables. Based on the percentages of gain, as summarized on the front page of this issue, there has been a positive increase in appropriations during the most recent two years. That is good news, indeed, because these systems are significant contributors to the skilled training of undergraduate and graduate students, developers of noteworthy research achievements, and successful partners with business and industry involving a myriad of cooperative ventures.

From the outset, it is important to define both of these segments of higher education. Multi-campus universities characteristically involve one, two or more campuses that are organizationally unified with a larger, and usually older, "mother" institution. All the campuses are governed by a single board that is usually located at or close to the flagship institution. Within this configuration, individual institutions usually grow from being predominately single-purpose educational entities into diverse, multipurpose institutions. These multi-campus universities frequently adhere to the description originally coined by Lee and Bowen as "flagship systems" which take on one or more of three forms: 1) a main campus with separate branches of two-year, four-year, or professional varieties; 2) the system, itself, creating and adding new campuses; and 3) either the system or the major campus "taking on" already existing campuses and reorganizing, and sometimes renaming them (Lee and Bowen, 1971, p.73).

The Consolidated Systems, on the other hand, are comprised of two or more higher education institutions that are autonomously administered, but are governed by a single board. These systems are created by legislative actions and several combinations have emerged. They generally involve the union of programmatically similar institutions. Some include all the public institutions within the state; examples are Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Massachusetts, Nevada, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Utah. More frequently, the system includes upper division institutions (in a few cases, including a multi-campus university) and excludes the two-year colleges. In some instances, there is more than one consolidated system within a state, easily identified in the table by the abbreviations preceding the names of the systems. In a few states (Tennessee is an example), there may be a system which includes some of the senior institutions with the two-year schools.

The 43 multi-campus universities and the 31 consolidated systems included in the tables individually received at least \$100,000,000 in state tax appropriations--a Grapevine gauge that delimits entry to each of the categories. Interestingly, there were no new additions or deletions in either category in FY1994-95, merely a shifting in ranks.

---

\*Rusty Higham, a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Educational Administration and Foundations at Illinois State University, serves as a research assistant with the Center for Higher Education and Educational Finance. He is President of the ISU Administrators Club and a recent recipient of the M. M. Chambers Scholarship in Higher Education.

In ten-year gains, two systems report 100% or more, the University of Nevada System and the Idaho Board of Education. Both systems include all segments of higher education. Sixteen systems realized ten-year gains of 50% and more; while 12 systems noted gains below 50%, with only one in the single-digit category and none with a negative

Notable positive gains over recent years are the two systems in New York (SUNY, 17% versus 0% last year; CUNY, 15% versus -4% last year) and California State University (4% compared with -10% in FY1993-94). In the weighted average calculation, the influence of the top five which received a little more than 40% of the appropriated dollars, greatly impact the two-year gain for this group as a whole. If a simple arithmetic average is calculated the two-year gain is 8.3%. While trends for segments of the total higher education enterprise are important and the differences between methods of calculations are of interest, perhaps a better comparison is for each state to track its own progress over time.

#### Reference

Lee, E. C., and F. M. Bowen. The Multi-campus University: A Study of Academic Governance. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (New York: McGraw-Hill) 1971.

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

Address correction requested

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

**Grapevine**

### Multi-campus Universities

The aforementioned 43 multi-campus universities collectively received \$13.1 billion in state tax appropriations for FY1994-95. This figure represents 30.6% of the \$42.8 billion of total appropriations nationwide. As was the case in FY1993-94, the Universities of California and Texas each received over one billion dollars for operating expenses during FY1994-95. These two multi-campus universities accounted for 22.6% (contrasted with 23.1% in the last fiscal year) of the total shown in the table.

The University of Illinois was again the recipient of the third largest dollar amount in FY1994-95 with over \$613 million, an increase of 4.5% over the previous year and noticeably higher than the 2.1% and 1.1% gains experienced by the Universities of California and Texas, respectively. A trio of multi-campus universities followed in the \$400 million range, headed by the University of Minnesota. Ten universities were in the \$300 million range and the remaining 27 (almost two-thirds) of the institutions were in the \$100 million and \$200 million grouping.

All told, there were 11 (25.6%) of the multi-campus universities with double-digit two-year gains, highlighted by the University of Mississippi's clearly noticeable 44% gain. Part of this unusually large gain can be accounted for by sizeable one-time appropriations to the institutions in Mississippi, but even without these one-time appropriations, the University of Mississippi would still head the list of two-year gains. Two Alabama institutions experienced 20% gains. Other noteworthy "same-state" gainers were New Mexico State University (17%) and the University of New Mexico (16%). Compared with last year's multi-campus two-year report, this year's list of 43 included 36 (83.7%) positive gainers versus 26 (60.5%) in FY1993-94, and six (14.0%) no-gain or negative gain universities versus 16 (37.2%) in FY1993-94. These data confirm the rejuvenated emphasis a majority of state governments are placing in their multi-campus universities by increasing tax appropriations to them.

Data regarding multi-campus universities' ten-year gains revealed the following: three universities had gains of 100% or more, including the University of Alabama (110%), the University of Hawaii (108%), and Auburn University (104%); almost half of the universities had ten-year gains of 50% or more; 19 schools were under 50% with 10 of these in the 35% to 49% range. Only one university had a decline over 10 years, Louisiana State University (-1%).

### Consolidated Systems

In the table of consolidated systems are listed 31 systems of higher education, each of which received \$100,000,000 or more of state tax funds. Cumulatively, these systems received \$15.2 billion or 35.5% of the \$42.8 billion appropriated to higher education nationwide. In FY1994-95, there were five systems which received more than one billion dollars. In the next tier, six consolidated systems received at least \$500 million. Nine systems received at least \$200 million and the remaining 11 systems were between \$100 million and \$200 million. The most significant system two-year gains were experienced by the Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning with 45%. As previously noted this percentage was inflated by one-time appropriations, but even if that is taken into account, the percentage would still place Mississippi at the top. The University of Georgia and the Idaho Board of Education came next with 19%. There were 11 double-digit gainers (compared with seven in FY1993-94), 13 single-digit gainers (compared with 12 last year), and six in the zero or negative percentage change position (compared with 11 last year). Based on percentages of gain over two years, it appears the trend is upward.

THIRTY-ONE CONSOLIDATED SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, EACH RECEIVING \$100,000,000 OR MORE OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES, FISCAL YEARS 1984-85, 1992-93, AND 1994-95, WITH PERCENTAGES OF GAIN OVER THE MOST RECENT TWO AND TEN YEARS. (In thousands of dollars)

STATE/SYSTEM	Year 1984-85	Year 1992-93	Year 1994-95	2yr-Gain Percent	10yr-Gain Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
CA California State U	1,142,926	1,490,055	1,553,150	4	36
NY State U of NY	1,151,511	1,149,259	1,340,439	17	16
NC U of North Carolina	700,904	1,145,895	1,264,622	10	80
GA U System of Georgia	611,867	941,363	1,119,936	19	83
FL St U System of Florida	651,871	930,408	1,079,861	16	66
MA Board of Regents	641,844	650,187	902,934	N/C	N/C
WI U of Wisconsin System	514,392	735,201	790,908	8	54
MS Insts of Higher Learning	338,906	434,246	628,607	45	85
NY City U of New York	421,038	540,093	618,937	15	47
AZ Board of Regents	329,455	532,987	581,066	9	76
MD U of Maryland	330,268	525,898	552,178	5	67
IA Board of Regents	301,939	457,121	487,292	7	61
TN Bd of Regents System	269,335	412,254	480,013	16	78
KS Board of Regents	306,175	411,929	443,162	8	45
UT Board of Regents	235,801	350,936	397,539	13	69
PA St System of Higher Ed	250,251	359,352	373,682	4	49
OR System of High Ed	216,896	369,919	329,796	- 11	52
ID Board of Education	112,240	190,593	226,908	19	102
LA Bd of Trustees System	184,826	219,283	219,834	0	19
WV State University System	138,209	204,434	218,765	7	58
NV U of Nevada System	78,645	207,572	194,439	- 6	147
IL Board of Regents	133,702	169,242	184,227	9	38
MN State University System	110,924	175,652	179,621	2	62
IL Board of Governors	119,947	154,719	170,970	11	43
ND Bd of Higher Education	110,534	151,191	143,864	- 5	30
ME U of Maine System	71,564	132,376	132,726	0	85
RI Bd of Governors for H Ed	104,366	107,628	125,034	16	20
MT Montana U System	107,362	123,228	113,156	- 8	5
CO State Bd of Agriculture	72,475	107,221	111,480	4	54
SD Board of Regents	57,708	95,476	102,086	7	77
TX State University System	81,484	95,186	101,761	7	25
<b>Totals</b>	<b>9,899,365</b>	<b>13,570,904</b>	<b>15,168,993</b>		
<b>Weighted averages percentages of gain</b>				<b>12</b>	<b>53</b>