DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 281 HE 027 139

TITLE An Analysis of Public University Administrative and

Support Functions.

INSTITUTION Illinois State Board of Higher Education,

Springfield.

PUB DATE 13 Jul 93

NOTE 53p.

PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Ancillary School Services; *College Administration;

Comparative Analysis; Costs; Educational Facilities;

Educational Finance; *Expenditure per Student;

*Expenditures; *Governance; Higher Education; *Public Colleges; Resource Allocation; State Colleges; State

Universities; Statistical Data

IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

This report analyzes fiscal year 1992 expenditures for all but three of the administrative and support subfunctions included in the Illinois Resource Allocation and Management Program which collects expenditure data from Illinois public universities on 55 separate groupings of activities referred to as subfunctions or subprograms. Expenditures in rour areas are detailed in tables: (1) subfunctions that support the institutions' academic missions, such as library services; (2) subfunctions that provide services to students, such as counseling and financial aid; (3) subfunctions that provide institution-wide management and support, such as executive and financial management; and (4) subfunctions that provide operations and maintenance of the physical plant. The appendix shows the specific subfunctions that are aligned with each of these broad areas. In addition, at least three comparative analyses are provided for each of the four areas. All analyses are presented by campus for interinstitutional comparisons. Recommendations are presented which address the handling of administrative and support functions. (GLR)



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

Diffus document has been reproduced as recaived from the person or organization originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

 Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Illin is State Board of Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Item #5A July 13, 1993

STATE OF ILLINOIS BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

AN ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT FUNCTIONS

Higher education's efforts to focus priorities, strengthen quality, and enhance productivity extend to administrative and support functions, as well as the primary functions of instruction, research, and public service. All administrative and support functions such as the operation of academic libraries, admissions, records, and financial aid offices, and student counseling services contribute to the effectiveness of public universities' instruction, research, and public service missions. Moreover, previous reports to the Committee of the Whole have documented that administrative and support functions account for approximately half of all expenditures from state-appropriated funds and are among the fastest growing expenditure categories.

The Board of Higher Education's guidelines for productivity improvements in higher education call upon institutions to examine administrative and support functions on the basis of their centrality to the institution's mission, changes in the breadth of activity of these functions, redundancy of operations among the functions, and the efficiency of operations themselves. The purpose of this item is to provide public universities with a comparative analysis of fiscal year 1992 expenditures for administrative and other support functions that can be utilized in applying the Priorities, Quality, and Productivity (P•Q•P) guidelines at the campus level. Potential areas for productivity improvements, or at least for further institutional examination, are highlighted throughout the report. More specific guidelines relative to productivity improvements in administrative and support areas are scheduled to be presented in November of 1993 to be addressed by institutions in their 1994 productivity reports. In addition, this report recommends that statewide reporting of support function reviews be discontinued, and that institutions expand upon the comparative analysis presented in this report. These steps are recommended to more directly align analyses and evaluations of administrative and support functions with the P•Q•P initiative.

The fiscal year 1992 expenditures presented in this report are those reported by the public universities in the most recent Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP) submission and represent unaudited figures. RAMP collects expenditure data from public universities on 55 separate groupings of activities referred to as "subfunctions" or "subprograms". The individual public universities are responsible for the allocation of expenditures among the various subfunctions within the RAMP guidelines. The utility of this analysis is dependent upon comparable allocation procedures among campuses.

This report analyzes fiscal year 1992 expenditures for all but three of the administrative and support subfunctions included in RAMP. Expenditures for hospital and patient services at Southern Illinois University and the University of Illinois, intercollegiate athletics expenditures, which were presented to the Board in March 1993, and expenditures for the rental of space are excluded from these analyses. A listing of the specific subfunctions and their definitions is provided in the Appendix.

For the purposes of this report, the separate administrative and support subfunctions have been accumulated among four broad areas: 1) subfunctions that support the institutions' academic missions, such as library services; 2) subfunctions that provide services to students, such as counseling and financial aid; 3) subfunctions that provide institution-wide management and support, such as executive and financial management; and 4) subfunctions that provide operations and maintenance of the physical plant. The Appendix shows the specific subfunctions that are aligned with each of these broad areas. At least three comparative analyses are provided for each of the four areas.



Expenditures in the four areas are presented as a ratio to each institution's expenditures for the primary functions of instruction, research, and public service. This comparison provides perspective on the priority among primary and support areas. In addition, expenditures for individual administrative and support areas are presented as ratios to relevant institutional characteristics and activities; for example, dollars spent for financial aid administration per financial aid recipient and the dollars spent for departmental administration per faculty staff-year. All analyses are presented by campus for interinstitutional comparisons. Unless otherwise noted, all references to expenditures in this report refer to those from state-appropriated funds. Total expenditures including non-appropriated funds and their appropriate ratios are provided for some individual subfunctions when non-appropriated funds represent a high proportion of total expenditures.

The comparative ratios presented in this report are not intended to be exhaustive; rather they are intended to help institutions raise questions about administrative and support processes and practices and the allocation of resources to these functions. Further, the analyses presented are not intended to be definitive measures of good practice. In many cases, institutions can and should extend these analyses by examining costs associated with more specific activities and benchmarking them to more specific outcome measures.

Fiscal Year 1992 Administrative and Support Expenditures

Table 1 displays the fiscal year 1992 expenditures from state-appropriated funds for the four administrative and support areas noted above and the primary functions of instruction, research, and public service. Table 1 shows that in fiscal year 1992, the 12 public universities expended a total of \$1.3 billion from state-appropriated funds. Of that total, \$699.0 million, or 54 percent, were expended for instruction, research, and public service; \$595.6 million, or 46 percent, were expended for administrative and support functions. Table 2 displays these same administrative and support expenditures as a ratio to expenditures for instruction, research, and public service. On average, the twelve public universities expended \$852 for administrative and support functions for every \$1,000 spent for instruction, research, and public service.

The figures provided in Tables 1 and 2 highlight noteworthy differences among campuses. Six public university campuses expended less for administrative and support functions than for the primary functions of instruction, organized research, and public service, while six expended more. The range of total administrative and support costs per \$1,000 of primary function expenditures among the twelve public universities is from \$663 at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale to \$1,325 at the Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. Larger campuses with comprehensive research and public service missions have, of course, proportionately higher expenditures for primary functions.

Individual campuses also differ in the allocation of resources within administrative and support functions. For example, among the Board of Governors campuses that are above the statewide average administrative and support function expenditures per \$1,000 primary function expenditures, Eastern Illinois University shows higher expenditures for academic mission-related support and lower expenditures for O & M of Physical Plant support. Governors State University, by contrast, shows higher costs for student services and institution-wide management. Chicago State University's ratios for institution-wide management and for O & M of physical plant are also higher. Sangamon State University and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville also show higher costs for institution-wide management compared to primary function expenditures, and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville and Northern Illinois University reported higher ratios for functions that support the institutions' academic missions. The sections below provide more detailed analysis within each of these four functional areas.



Support for the Institutions' Academic Missions

Table 3 displays the fiscal year 1992 expenditures from state-appropriated funds accumulated for administrative and support functions that support the institutions' academic missions. Table 3 restates the ratio to \$1,000 of primary function expenditures and also displays expenditures per faculty staff-year, per full-time-equivalent (FTE) student, and per approved degree program. While the ratio to primary functions provides perspective on the relative priority among primary and support functions, these additional ratios give insight into the level of expenditures relative to clientele being served. Tables 3A through 3C provide the fiscal year 1992 expenditures for three of the major subfunctions in this area: departmental administration, library services, and academic administration.

On average, as presented in Table 3, for academic mission support activities, the public universities expended \$16,374 per faculty staff-year, \$1,170 per FTE student, and \$137,483 per approved degree program. Northern Illinois University's and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville's pattern of relatively higher expenditures for this support area compared to primary functions is seen in these comparisons. The University of Illinois at Chicago also shows high expenditures per faculty staff-year and exhibits higher than average expenditures per FTE student and per degree program. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's ratios on Table 3 present another interesting pattern. While the campus' ratio to instruction, research, and public service expenditures is relatively low reflecting its comprehensive research and public service mission, its expenditures per FTE student and per degree program are higher than the public universities' average.

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale's and Western Illinois University's relatively low ratios on Table 3 can be attributed in large part to much lower than average expenditures for departmental administration. Table 3A compares state-appropriated funds and all funds expenditures for departmental administration with faculty staff-years, the number of departments, and the number of approved degree programs. Since Sangamon State University is not organized by departments, this ratio is not available for the campus. Eastern Illinois University, Northern Illinois University, and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville each show high ratios of expenses for departmental administration compared to faculty staff-years, number of departments, and number of approved degree programs.

Table 3B presents library services expenditures in relation to the number of volumes held, FTE students, and faculty staff-years. Chicago State University and the University of Illinois at Chicago show relatively high expenditures per volume; Illinois State University and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign show low expenditures per volume. Both campuses of the University of Illinois along with Sangamon State University show relatively higher expenditures per FTE student; Sangamon State University because of its smaller enrollment and the University of Illinois because of library expenditures associated with research and public service functions.

Table 3C displays fiscal year 1992 expenditures from state appropriated funds for academic administration in relation to primary functions, faculty staff years, and degree programs. Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville and the University of Illinois at Chicago show relatively higher expenditures per primary function and per faculty staff year. Table 3C also shows that Sangamon State University expended the least of any public university for academic administration resulting in ratios that are among the lowest of the public universities on all three measures.

Support for Services To Students

Table 4 presents the fiscal year 1992 expenditures for administrative and support functions devoted to providing services to students. In addition to repeating the ratio to instruction, research, and public service expenditures, Table 4 also displays fiscal year 1992 expenditures per headcount and FTE student and per average annual graduate. In general, Board of Governors' and Board of Regents' institutions, along with Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, tend to spend



·**3-**

proportionately more from state-appropriated funds for student services compared to primary function expenditures. In part, this reflects a less comprehensive research mission at these institutions. Governors State University and the University of Illinois at Chicago tend to spend more on services to students functions per headcount and FTE student than do other campuses. Tables 4A through 4D provide fiscal year 1992 expenditures for four of the major subfunctions in this area — admissions, registration, and records; social and cultural development activities; student health and medical services; and financial aid administration.

Table 4A displays the fiscal year 1992 state appropriated expenditures for admissions, registrations, and records functions at each public university in relation to the number of first-time freshmen, headcount students, and average annual number of graduates. The ratios for first-time freshmen for Sangamon State University and Governors State University are not available since these two institutions do not admit freshmen. Chicago State University, Northeastern Illinois University, and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville show relatively high expenditures for these functions in relation to other campuses. Governors State University shows high costs compared to both head ount students and average annual graduates.

Student services expenditures from state-appropriated funds, however, represent only a small percentage of total expenditures. Tables 4B and 4C display both state-appropriated expenditures and expenditures from all funds for social and cultural development activities and for student health and medical services. As these tables show, the majority of expenditures for these activities are derived from student fees which are locally held and not appropriated. Comparing expenditures from state-appropriated funds with expenditures from all funds highlights some differences among campuses. For example, while Illinois State University, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign show low expenditures from state-appropriated funds per student for health and medical services (see Table 4C), the campuses are among the highest when all funds are considered. As institutions examine their support functions in the coming year, they should include a policy review of student and user fees as part of their examination of student services.

Institution-wide Management and Support

Table 5 presents the fiscal year 1992 expenditures for the functions that provide institution-wide management and support. The public universities expended an average of \$188 for these activities for every \$1,000 in expenditures for instruction, research, and public service. Chicago State University, Governors State University, Sangamon State University, and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville reported higher than average ratios. Western Illinois University and both campuses of the University of Illinois reported lower than average ratios.

Table 5 also shows these expenditures per faculty staff-year, per FTE student, and per \$1,000 of total expenditures. Governors State University and Sangamon State University show higher ratios per FTE student and faculty staff-years, in part reflecting their lower enrollment base.

While expenditures from other than appropriated funds do not represent a large proportion of the total expenditures for institution-wide management and support activities, Tables 5A through 5C display both sources of funds for three major subfunctions: executive management, financial management, and public relations and development. Activities within these areas extend to operations funded by other than state appropriations and, therefore, expenditure ratios in these areas most appropriately should consider all activities. In all three subfunctions, the statewide average ratios decline when all expenditures and all staff are considered. Expenditures per student, of course, do not ine, since enrollments are not differentiated by fund source.

Table 5A provides specific detail on expenditures for executive management. Chicago State University, Governors State University, and Sangamon State University, all smaller campuses, show relatively higher costs for this function on a per FTE student basis than do other public universities,



while Eastern Illinois University and Western Illinois University show relatively lower costs. Both campuses of the University of Illinois have lower expenditures per staff-year than do the other public universities.

Public relations and development is an activity that has received increased attention at several public universities in recent years. Table 5C displays the fiscal year 1992 expenditures from state-appropriated and non-appropriated funds for each public university campus in relation to primary functions, staff-years, and FTE students. Governors State University, Illinois State University, Sangamon State University, and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale exhibit relatively higher expenditure levels on all ratios compared to other campuses.

Operations and Maintenance (O & M) of the Physical Plant

Table 6 displays fiscal year 1992 expenditures from state-appropriated funds for O & M of the physical plant. In addition to comparing these expenditures to research, instruction, and public services expenditures, a ratio to non-residential square feet is provided. Generally, the twelve public university campuses show similar patterns: as a group, they averaged \$270 per \$1,000 of primary function expenditures and \$5.66 per non-residential square foot. Chicago State University, Governors State University, Northeastern Illinois University, and the University of Illinois at Chicago show slightly higher than average ratios, while Western Illinois University and Northern Illinois University are somewhat lower.

As was the case with student services, the majority of expenditures for many of the subfunctions within O & M of Physical Plant are derived from other than state-appropriated funds. Legislative Audit Commission guidelines do not allow state-appropriated funds to be used to support auxiliary enterprises such as dormitories or student dining halls--such activities are self-supporting through locally held user fees. Tables 6A through 6E display state-appropriated funds expenditures and expenditures from all funds for five subfunctions within this area--superintendence of O & M; custodial activities; repairs, maintenance, and grounds upkeep; utility support; and security and fire protection.

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign exhibits a different pattern from most other public universities when expenditures from state appropriated funds for the superintendence of O & M are compared to expenditures from non-appropriated funds (see Table 6A). When state-appropriated funds are considered, the campus is lower than the statewide average compared to primary functions and per non-residential square foot. When expenditures from all funds are considered, the campuses ratios exceed the statewide average. The campus shows a similar pattern relative to expenditures for repairs, maintenance, and groundskeeping (see Table 6C). This pattern is likely the result of the relatively large amount of indirect cost reimbursements on research grants that the university is able to justify for physical plant operations and maintenance.

Table 6B shows that Chicago State University and Northeastern Illinois University tend to spend more for custodial functions per square foot than do other campuses. These two campuses also show higher ratios for utility support (see Table 6D) along with Governors State University and the University of Illinois at Chicago, suggesting that the Chicago area campuses pay higher utility rates. Finally, Chicago State University, Governors State University, Northeastern Illinois University, and Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville spend relatively more for security and fire protection as a percent of total O & M expenditures and on a square foot basis (see Table 6E) than do other campuses.



s- 6

Conclusions and Next Steps

The analyses presented in this report underscore the diversity among public universities in priorities and allocation of resources and the impact of enrollments, geography, external funds, and other factors on these decisions. They also provide campuses and governing boards with some indicators of specific administrative and support functions areas that should be examined in greater depth. Campus examinations should be linked to the Board of Higher Education's guidelines for productivity improvements. A modification of the support function review process can facilitate that linkage.

The public universities, governing boards, and the Board of Higher Education cooperatively developed and conducted a support function review process parallelling the academic review process. Both the academic and support function review processes are incorporated in the RAMP planning process, and both have been conducted on a cyclical basis for several years.

Beyond these similarities, there is an important distinction between academic and support function reviews. While program improvement has been a major emphasis of academic program review in recent years, the Board of Higher Education has a statutory responsibility to recommend to individual governing boards academic programs that may no longer be educationally or economically justified and, therefore, candidates for elimination. By contrast, very few support functions are or can be candidates for elimination. Bills must continue to be paid, payrolls must be processed, libraries must continue to be staffed, and financial aid must continue to be awarded. Rather, changes to the scope of activities, improvements in the quality of service provided, and increases in the efficiency of operations are the more likely outcomes of a thorough evaluation of a support area. Moreover, changes in the level of activity can free resources for reinvestment in higher priority areas and activities.

While the current support function review process provides universities with considerable flexibility in the scope and procedures used in performing the reviews, the process can be further modified to be even more congruent with the public universities, governing boards, and Board of Higher Education P•Q•P process. The annual July RAMP submission requirements should be eliminated. Rather, the Board of Higher Education staff should publish modified forms of the data that appear in this report, variations of which were previously published as RAMP Reports. In addition, institutions should conduct their own, more detailed and comparative analyses of specific activity levels comparing resource commitments to outcomes.

One source for national comparative data is the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) Benchmarking Survey. The objective of the NACUBO Benchmarking Survey is to provide comparative data that will stimulate the search for best practices in the administrative operations of colleges and universities. The Survey gathers performance data in over 35 functional areas and provides customized analytical services. Campuses may want to consider reallocating resources from current support function review procedures to cover the costs of participating in the NACUBO, or similar, studies.

Utilizing the comparative analyses developed in this and subsequent reports and their own more detailed benchmarking activities, universities and governing boards should apply the P•Q•P guidelines for administrative and support functions. Specifically, they should:

determine whether or not each administrative or support activity is central to the
institutional mission. Institutions should reduce or eliminate state funds that support
units not central to their missions, especially when expenditures exceed the statewide
average;



- examine the breadth and scope of activities within each administrative and support area to ensure that growth is justified in relation to clientele served and improved productivity;
- determine whether or not more than one administrative or support unit is providing similar services, and consolidate units where such redundancy is found; and
- develop comparative or benchmarked expenditures and expenditure ratios to identify units with significantly higher or lower ratios and to discover and adopt best practices in relatively low overhead units.

Based on this examination, institutions should report their findings, actions taken, and results realized in annual productivity reports.



7. 8

Table 1

FISCAL YEAR 1992 STATE APPROPRIATED FUNDS EXPENDITURES BY ILLINOIS PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES FOR SUPPORT AND PRIMARY FUNCTIONS

(in thousands of dollars)

Total	Support and Primary Functions	32,401.9	50,820.7 23,650.5	42,478.7 60,561.5	233,002.7 95,729.6 116.075.4	21,197.7	222,393.9 158,102.1 64,291.8	629,320.0 282,369.7 346,950.3	\$ 1,294,629.9	100.0 %
	Primary Functions ¹	\$ 105,848.0 14,645.0	25,283.4 11,138.4	20,188.4 34,592.8	120,522.9 50,338.1 59,689.2	10,495.6	122,721.7 95,068.4 27,653.3	349,947.6 144,421.9 205,525.7	\$ 699,040.2	54.0 %
	O & M Physical Plant	\$ 30,383.6 5,273.1	6,774.5 3,591.7	6,102.8 8,641.5	29,269,7 14,093,2 12,421,5	2,755.0	28,295.6 20,021.4 8,274.2	100,973.4 51,573.9 49,399.5	\$ 188,922.3	14.6 %
Support Functions	Institutional Management/ Support	\$ 26,411.0 4,800.3	3,598.7	5,611.3 6,450.3	26,277.0 10,001.9	3,839,6	28,347.7 18,998.2 9,349.6	<u>50,231.3</u> 24,705.6 25,525.7	\$ 131,2(7.1	10.1 %
Support	Student Services	\$ 16,327.3 2,906.5	3,483.2 2,458.7	3,216.5 4,262.4	15,278.4 6,154.7 7.716.8	1,406.9	11,787.5 7,501.4 4,286.1	25,919.4 11,809.6 14,109.8	\$ 69,312.6	5.4 %
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Support for Academic Missions	\$ 30,943.4 4,777.0		y 7,359.7 6,614.5	41,654.7 15,141.7 23,812,4	2,700.6	31,241.4 16,512.8 14,728.6	102,248.3 49,858.7 52,389.6	\$ 206,087.8	15.9 %
		Board of Governors Chicago State University	Eastern Illinois University Governors State University	Northeastern Illinois University Western Illinois University	Board of Regents Illinois State University Northern Illinois University	Sangamon State University	Southern Illinois University Carbondale Edwardsville	University of Illinois Chicago Urbana – Champaign	Total	Percent of Total

Primary functions include instruction, departmental and organized research, and public service.

Source: Public Universities' Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP)



Table 2

BY ILLINOIS PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES FOR SUPPORT AND PRIMARY FUNCTIONS! PER THOUSAND DOLLARS OF PRIMARY FUNCTIONS EXPENDITURES FISCAL YEAR 1992 STATE APPROPRIATED FUNDS EXPENDITURES

	Support for Academic Missions	Student Services	Institutional Management/ Support	O & M Physical Plant	Total Support Functions
Board of Governors Chicago State University		198	\$ 250 328	\$ 287 360	\$ 983 1,212
Eastern tilmois University Governors State University Northeastern Illinois University Western Illinois University	369 257 365 191	138 221 159 123	233 323 278 186	322 302 250	1,010 1,123 1,104 751
Board of Regents Illinois State University Northern Illinois University Sangamon State University	346 301 399 257	122 122 129 134	218 199 208 366	243 280 208 262	933 902 945 1,020
Southern Illinois University Carbondale Edwardsville	255 174 533	96 79 155	231 200 338	231 211 299	81 <u>2</u> 663 1,325
University of Illinois Chicago Urbana – Champaign	292 345 255	74 82 69	144 171 124	289 357 240	79 <u>8</u> 955 688
Total	\$ 295	66 \$	\$ 188	\$ 270	\$ 852

¹ Primary functions include instruction, departmental and organized research, and public service.

Source: Public Universities' Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP)



Table 3

ACADEMIC MISSION SUPPORT FUNCTIONS EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO PRIMARY FUNCTIONS EXPENDITURES, TOTAL FACULTY STAFF-YEARS, FTE STUDENTS, AND NUMBER OF DEGREE PROGRAMS

Per Degree Program	\$92,645 68,243 129,572 71,575 111,511 76,913	140,252 142,846 165,364 57,460 110,393 84,249 169,294	174,783 228,710 142,751 \$137,483
Per FTE Student	\$ 790 872 865 877 951 555	962 771 1,155 885 1,009 778 1,510	1,631 2,115 1,340 \$ 1,170
Per Faculty Staff – Year	\$14,182 12,564 16,304 13,479 19,131	17,044 15,316 18,728 14,690 10,346 25,144	17,693 22,368 14,758
Per \$1,000 of Primary Functions ¹ Expenditures	\$292 326 369 257 365 191	346 301 399 257 255 174 533	292 345 255 \$295
Actual FY1992 (in ,000s)	\$ 30,943.4 4,777.0 9,329.2 2,863.0 ty 7,359.7 6,614.5	41,654.7 15,141.7 23,812.4 2,700.6 31,241.4 16,512.8 14,728.6	102,248.3 49,858.7 52,389.6 \$ 206,087.8
	Soard of Governors Chicago State University Eastern Illinois University Governors State University Northeastern Illinois University Western Illinois University	Board of Regents Illinois State University Northern Illinois University Sangamon State University Carbondale Edwardsville	University of Illinois (Ticago Urbana Champaign Total

¹ Primary functions include instruction, departmental and organized research, and public service.



97

Table 3A

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL FACULTY STAFF-YEARS, NUMBER OF DEPARTMENTS, AND NUMBER OF DEGREE PROGRAMS

Actual
(in ,000s) Staff-Year
\$10,682.5 \$4,896
2,375.4 6,248
4,528.8 7,914
778.1 3,663
1,955.0 5,082
1,045.2 1,653
19,537.5
6,950.0 7,030
11,937.7 9,389
649.8 3,535
2,619.6 1,641
6,251.5 10,672
13,388.0 6,006
15,603.0 4,395
\$68,082.1

Source: Public Universities' Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP)

Table 3B

LIBRARY SERVICES EXPENDITURES FROM STATE APPROPRIATED FUNDS IN RELATION TO VOLUMES HELD, FTE ENROLLMENT, AND FACULTY STAFF-YEARS

	Actual FY1992 (in.000s)	Per Volume	Per FTE Student	Per Faculty Staff – Year
Board of Governors Chicago State University	1.488.1	\$3.51	\$266	\$4,770
Eastern Illinois University	2,684.6	3.97	249	4,692
Governors State University	1,154.2	3.33	354	5,434
Northeastern Illinois University	2,263.8	3.58	293	5,885
Western Illinois University	2,816.6	2.93	236	4,455
Board of Regents	13,573.6	2.56	313	5,554
Illinois State University	5,364.3	1.74	273	5,426
Northern Illinois University	6,725.1	3.98	326	5,289
Sangamon State University	1,484.2	2.81	487	8,073
Southern Illinois University	11,721.8	3.22	378	5,373
Carbondale	8,533.2	3.43	402	5,347
Edwardsville	3,188.6	2.77	327	5,443
University of Illinois	28,703.1	2.60	458	4,967
Chicago	11,589.9	5.24	492	5,200
Urbana-Champaign	17,113.2	1.94	438	4,821
Total	\$ 64,405.8	\$2.81	\$366	\$5,117

Source: Public Universities' Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP)



Table 3C

ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION EXPENDITURES FROM STATE APPROPRIATED FUNDS IN RELATION TO PRIMARY FUNCTIONS EXPENDITURES, TOTAL FACULTY STAFF—YEARS, AND NUMBER OF DEGREE PROGRAMS

	Actual	Per \$1,000 of	Per	Per
	FY1992	Primary Functions ¹ Expenditures	Faculty Staff - Year	Degree
	(coop) III		100	TIME SOLVE
Board of Governors	\$ 6,966.8	266	53,193	\$20,859
Chicago State University	850.6	58	2,237	12,151
Eastern Illinois University	1,860.0	74	. 3,250	25,833
Governors State University	637.0	57	2,999	15,925
Northeastern Illinois University	, 1,302.0	64	3,384	19,727
Western Illinois University	2,317.2	29	3,665	26,944
Board of Regents	7,598.5	63	3,109	25,584
Illinois State University	2,458.1	49	2,486	23,190
Northern Illinois University	4,615.5	77	3,630	32,052
Sangamon State University	524.9	20	2,855	11,168
Southern Illinois University	7,480.4	61	3,429	26,432
Carbondale	3,592.7	38	2,251	18,330
Edwardsville	3,887.7	141	6,637	44,686
University of Illinois	35,753.3	102	6,187	61,117
Chicago	20,125.5	139	67076	92,319
Urbana – Champaign	15,627.8	92	4,402	42,583
Total	\$ 57,799.0	\$83	\$4,592	\$38,558

¹ Primary functions include instruction, departmental and organized research, and public service.

Source: Public Universities' Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP)



Table 4

HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT, FITE STUDENTS, AND AVERAGE ANNUAL GRADUATES SERVICES TO STUDENTS FUNCTIONS EXPENDITURES,

Per Average Annual Graduate	\$1,857 3,345 1,297 2,371 2,166 1,569	1,411 1,308 1,465 1,651	1,40 <u>2</u> 1,190 2,041	1,800 2,384 1,493	\$1,634
Per FTE Student	\$ 417 531 323 753 416 358	353 313 374 461	381 354 439	414 501 361	\$ 394
Per Headcount Student	\$ 326 363 308 438 285 309	294 273 310 312	$\frac{321}{302}$ 363	40 <u>9</u> 479 364	\$ 343
Per \$1,000 of Primary Functions ¹ Expenditures	\$ 154 198 138 221 159	127 122 129 134	$\frac{96}{79}$ 155	$\frac{74}{82}$	66 \$
Actual FY1992 (in,000s)	\$ 16,327.3 2,906.5 3,483.2 2,458.7 ty 3,216.5 4,262.4	15,278.4 6,154.7 7,716.8 1,406.9	11,787.5 7,501.4 4,286.1	25,919.4 11,809.6 14,109.8	\$ 69,312.6
	Board of Governors Chicago State University Eastern Illinois University Governors State University Northeastern Illinois University Western Illinois University	Board of Regents Illinois State University Northern Illinois University Sangamon State University	Southern Illinois University Carbondale Edwardsville	University of Illinois Chicago Urbana—Champaign	Total

¹ Primary functions include instruction, departmental and organized research, and public service.



Table 4A

STATE APPROPRIATED FUNDS IN RELATION TO THE NUMBER OF FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN, TOTAL HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT, AND AVERAGE ANNUAL GRADUATES ADMISSIONS, REGISTRATION, AND RECORDS EXPENDITURES FROM

·	Actual FY1992 (in ,000a)	Per First – time Freshman	Per Headcount Student	Per Average Annual Graduate
Board of Governors Chicago State University	\$ 7,508.1 1,559.6	\$1,236 2,131	\$150	\$854
Eastern Illinois University Governors State University	1,164.7	729 NA	103 261	434
Northeastern Illinois University Western Illinois University	1,535.7	1,871	136 129	1,034
Board of Regents Illinois State University Northern Illinois University Sangamon State University	6,263.7 2,525.1 3,151.7 586.9	907 822 988 NA	121 112 127 130	579 536 598 689
Southern Illinois University Carbondale Edwardsville	4,590.0 2,543.6 2,046.4	$\frac{1,339}{1,070}$ $1,949$	$\frac{12.5}{10.2}$	<u>546</u> 403 974
University of Illinois Chicago Urbana – Champaign	8,297.1 3,553.9 4,743.2	1,016 1,414 838	131 144 122	\$76 717 502
Total	\$ 26,658.9	\$1,082	\$132	\$628



Table 4B

STUDENT SOCIAL AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT UNDERGRADUATE, GRADUATE AND TOTAL STUDENTS

	Exper	enditures from state appropriated funds	propriated fun	ds		Expenditures from all funds	ı all funds	
	Actual	Per	Per	Per Total		Per	1	Per Total
	FY1992	FITE	FIE	FIE		FTE		FIE
	(in ,000s)	Undergraduate	Graduate	Student		Undergraduate	'	Student
Board of Governors	\$ 1,306.2	\$40	\$189	\$33		\$160		\$132
Chicago State University	177.4	39	181	32	1,102.9	245	1,127	201
Eastern Illinois University	231.4	24	220	21	1,197.8	123	1,136	111
Governors State University	388.2	217	263	119	723.5	405	490	222
Northeastern Illinois University	164.6	27	94	21	675.5	113	388	87
Western Illinois University	344.6	34	210	53	1,467.1	143	892	123
Board of Regents	1,250.5	35	177	29	7,493.2	207	1,058	173
Illinois State University	257.1	15	133	13	2,833.4	160	1,463	144
Northern Illinois University	843.4	51	215	4	4,391.9	263	1,119	213
Sangamon State University	150.0	82	123	49	267.9	146	220	88
Southern Illinois University	1,369.0	55	228	4	4,340.0	174	722	140
Carbondale	1,179.6	69	289	56	3,175.9	185	7:1	150
Edwardsville	189.4	24	86	19	1,164.1	149	6 04	119
University of Illinois	4,787.6	115	226	92	11,938.8	288	564	190
Chicago	2,105.3	145	232	8 0	2,311.3	159	255	86
Urbana-Champaign	2,682.3	66	222	69	9,627.5	356	797	246
Total	\$ 8,713.3	\$65	\$212	\$49	\$ 28,938.8	\$214	\$703	\$164



Table 4C

STUDENT HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO FULL—TIME EQUIVALENT UNDERGRADUATE, GRADUATE AND TOTAL STUDENTS

	Exper	Expenditures from state appropriated funds	propriated fun	sp		Expenditures from all funds	all funds	
	Actual	Per	Per	یتما	Actual	Per	Per	Per Total
	FY1992	FIE	FIE	FIE	FY1992	FIE	FIE	FIE
	(in ,000s)	Undergraduate	Graduate	Student	(s)000, ui)	Undergraduate	Graduate	Student
Board of Governors	\$ 806.9	\$25	\$117	\$21	\$ 2,234.7	\$69	\$324	\$57
Chicago State University	74.7	17	76	41	82.9	18	85	15
Eastern Illinois University	431.9	44	410	4	719.7	74	683	<i>L</i> 9
Governors State University	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Northeastern Illinois University	115.0	19	99	15	115.4	19	99	15
Western Illinois University	185.3	18	113	16	1,316.7	128	801	110
Board of Regents	537.3	15	<u>76</u>	12	7,494.5	207	1,059	173
Illinois State University	24.7	1	13	1	4,379.1	247	2,261	223
Northern Illinois University	445.5	27	114	22	2,921.4	175	745	142
Sangamon State University	67.1	37	55	22	194.0	106	159	64
Southern Illinois University	133.1	יוסי	22	411	8,141.4	326	1,354	263
Carbondale	133.1	9 0	33	9	7,698.7	449	1,885	363
Edwardsville	-0-	10-	-0-	-0-	442.7	57	230	45
University of Illinois	440.8	11 8	21	7 0	7,726.3	186 20	365	123
Chicago	440.0	90	ĵ,	.	0.0	90	4	6
UrbanaChampaign	-0-	-0-	-0-	101	7,285.5	270	603	186
Total	\$ 1,918.1	\$14	\$47	\$11	\$ 25,596.9	\$190	\$622	\$145

Source: Public Universities' Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP)



Table 4D

FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATION EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING AID AND VALUE OF AID RECEIVED

ı	Actual FY1992 (in 000s)	Per Unduplicated Aid Recipient	Per \$1,000 of Aid Awarded
Board of Governors Chicago State University	\$1,811.8	\$61 94	\$21 29
Eastern Illinois University	337.2	46	16
Governors State University	177.8	78	44
Northeastern Illinois University	364.0	59	29
Western Illinois University	517.0	51	16
Board of Regents	1,993.4	11	18
Illinois State University	1,168.0	97	23
Northern Illinois University	638.3	53	12
Sangamon State University	187.1	104	29
Southern Illinois University	1,235.6	44	10
Carbondale	9.808	38	∞
Edwardsville	427.0	61	17
University of Illinois	3,629.1	11	14
Chicago	2,141.3	135	21
Urbana – Champaign	1,487.8	48	10
Total	\$8,669.9	\$66	\$15

Source: Public Universities' Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP) and FY1992 Financial Aid Survey



Table 5

INSTITUTION—WIDE MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO PRIMARY FUNCTIONS EXPENDITURES TOTAL FACULTY STAFF—YEARS, AND FITE STUDENTS

	Actual FY1992 (in.000s)	Per \$1,000 of Primary Functions ¹ Expenditures	Per Faculty Staff – Year	Per FTE Student	Per \$1,000 of Total Expenditures
Board of Governors	\$ 26,411.0 4,800.3	\$25 <u>0</u>	\$12,105	\$674	\$124
Chicago State University		328	12,626	877	145
Eastern Illinois University	5,950.4	235	10,399	552	115
Governors State University	3,598.7	323	16,943	1,103	152
Northeastern Illinois University	y 5,611.3	278	14,586	725	129
Western Illinois University	6,450.3	186	10,201	541	104
Board of Regents Illinois State University Northern Illinois University Sangamon State University	26,277.0 10,001.9 12,435.5 3,839.6	218 199 208 366	$\frac{10,752}{10,117}$ 9,780 20,886	$\frac{607}{509} \\ 603 \\ 1,259$	111 103 104 179
Southern Illinois University	28,347.7	$\frac{231}{200}$	12,993	915	123
Carbondale	18,998.2		11,904	895	115
Edwardsville	9,349.6		15,961	958	142
University of Illinois Chicago Urbana – Champaign	50,231.3 24,705.6 25,525.7	$\frac{144}{171}$ 124	$\frac{8,692}{11,084}$ 7,190	$\frac{801}{1,048}$	75 76 73
Total	\$ 131,267.1	\$188	\$10,429	\$745	\$97

Primary functions include instruction, departmental and organized research, and public service.



34

Table 5A

EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL EXPENDITURES, TOTAL STAFF—YEARS, AND TOTAL FTE STUDENTS

	Expendi	nditures from state appropriated funds	propriated funds			Expenditures from all funds	n all funds	
1	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per	Per	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per	Per
	FY1992	of Total	Staff	FIE	FY1992	of Total	Staff	FIE
•	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Year	Student	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Year	Student
Board of Governors	\$9,310.6	\$44	\$1,823	\$238	\$ 9,690.6	\$29	\$ 1.363	\$247
Chicago State University	2,088.6	63	2,468	381	2,502.8	54	2,229	457
Eastern Illinois University	1,788.1	35	1,457	166	1,660.4	1.1	821	154
Governors State University	1,376.7	58	2,513	422	1,478.6	56	2,353	453
Northeastern Illinois University	2,166.5	50	2,125	280	2,251.8	42	1,812	291
Western Illinois University	1,890.7	31	1,290	159	1,797.1	17	829	151
Board of Regents	8,005.8	34	1,369	185	8,033.2	20	928	185
Illinois State University	2,596.9	27	1,132	132	2,597.8	16	737	132
Northern Illinois University	4,238.9	36	1,425	206	4,259.7	21	716	207
Sangamon State University	1,170.0	55	2,030	384	1,176.0	38	1,520	386
Southern Illinois University	8,340.3	36	1,498	569	8,753.2	23	1,048	283
Carbondale	5,614.6	34	1,384	265	5,962.8	21	955	281
Edwardsville	2,725.7	41	1,806	279	2,790.4	29	1,324	286
University of Illinois	9,730.5	14	616	155	13,468.2	61	468	215
Chicago	4,356.5	13	296	. 185	5,864.6	∞	448	249
Urbana-Champaign	5,374.0	15	633	137	7,603.6	10	484	194
Total	\$35,387.2	\$26	\$1,095	\$201	\$ 39,945,1	\$16	\$ 755	\$227

Source: Public Universities' Resource Allocation and Management Program (RAMP)

38

Table 5B

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL EXPENDITURES, TOTAL STAFF-YEARS, AND TOTAL FIE STUDENTS

•	Exper	Expenditures from state appropriated funds	propriated fund			Expenditures from all funds	all funds	
	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per	Per	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per	Per
	FY1992	of Total	Staff	FTE	FY1992	of Total	Staff	FTE
	(in,000s)	Expenditures	Year	Student	(in,000s)	Expenditures	Year	Student
Board of Governors	\$6,157.9	\$29	\$1,206	\$157	\$ 7,070.1	\$21	\$66\$	\$180
Chicago State University	1,121.4	34	1,325	205	1,248.8	27	1,112	228
Eastern Illinois University	1,133.4	22	924	105	1,526.6	16	755	142
Governors State University	1,168.2	49	2,133	358	1,221.4	4€	1,944	374
Northeastern Illinois University	1,780.6	41	1,746	230	1,903.7	35	1,532	246
Western Illinois University	954.3	15	651	80	1,169.6	11	529	86
Board of Regents	3,721.0	16	929	98	4,110.7	10	475	28
Illinois State University	1,468.3	15	640	75	1,478.9	6	419	75
Northern Illinois University	1,682.6	14	995	82	1,954.5	10	448	95
Sangamon State University	570.1	27	686	187	677.3	22	875	222
Southern Illinois University	4,922.6	21	884	159	6,337.5	16	759	205
Carbondale	3,422.3	21	843	161	4,826.3	17	773	227
Edwardsville	1,500.3	23	966	154	1,511.2	16	717	155
University of Illinois	7,980.3	12	202	127	18,531.3	13	644	296
Chicago	4,720.2	15	646	200	14,029.5	20	1,072	595
Urbana-Champaign	3,260.1	6	384	83	4,501.8	9	287	115
Total	\$22,781.8	\$17	\$705	\$129	\$ 36,049.7	\$14	\$681	\$205

38

Table 5C

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL EXPENDITURES, TOTAL STAFF—YEARS, AND TOTAL FIE STUDENTS

	Exper	Expenditures from state appropriated funds	propriated fun	र्भ		Expenditures from all funds	all funds	
	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per		Actual	Per \$1,000	Per	Per
	FY1992	of Total	Staff	FTE	FY1992	of Total	Staff	FIE
	(in,000s)	Expenditures	Year	Student	(in.000s)	Expenditures	Year	Student
Board of Governors	\$ 2,735.3	\$13	\$536	\$70	\$ 2,806.3	88	\$395	\$72
Chicago State University	345.0	10	408	63	365.3	∞	325	29
Eastern Illinois University	780.5	15	989	72	800.2	œ	396	74
Governors State University	448.6	19	819	137	448.6	17	714	137
Northeastern Illinois University	503.6	12	494	65	511.6	6	412	99
Western Illinois University	657.6	11	449	55	9'089	9	325	57
Board of Regents	3,021.0	13	517	70	3,146.8	20 1	363	23
Illinois State University	1,869.1	19	815	95	1,974.1	12	260	101
Northern Illinois University	779.8	7	262	38	779.8	4	179	38
Sangamon State University	372.1	17	646	122	393.2	13	208	129
Southern Illinois University	3,807.0	17	684	123	4,012.3	0]	480	130
Carbondale	3,011.7	18	742	142	3,204.2	11	513	151
Edwardsville	795.3	12	527	82	808.1	œ	384	83
University of Illinois	5,459.3	00 1	345	87	6,460.3	νı	224	103
Chicago	2,410.9	7	330	102	2,872.4	4	220	122
Urbana-Champaign	3,048.4	٥	329	78	3,587.9	¥G	228	92
Total	\$ 15,022.6	\$11	\$465	\$85	\$ 16,425.7	\$6	\$310	\$93

Table 6

PHYSICAL PLANT SUPPORT FUNCTIONS
EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO PRIMARY FUNCTIONS
EXPENDITURES AND NON-RESIDENTIAL SQUARE FEET

	Actual FY1992 (in.000s)	Per \$1,000 of Primary Functions ¹ Expenditures	Per Non- Residential Square Foot
Board of Governors Chicago State University	\$ 30,383.6	360	\$5.53
Eastern Illinois University	6,774.5	268	4.79
Governors State University	3,591.7	322	7.89
Northeastern Illinois University	6,102.8	302	6.70
Western Illinois University	8,641.5	250	4.29
Board of Regents	29,269.7	243	5.15
Illinois State University	14,093.2	280	5.55
Northern Illinois University	12,421.5	208	4.73
Sangamon State University	2,755.0	262	5.27
Southern Illinois University	28,295.6	231	5.70
Carbondale	20,021.4	211	5.77
Edwardsville	8,274.2	299	5.51
University of Illinois	100,973.4	289	5.87
Chicago	51,573.9	357	7.27
Urbana-Champaign	49,399.5	240	4.89
Total	\$ 188,922.3	\$270	\$5.66

1 Primary functions include instruction, departmental and organized research, and public service.



Table 6A

SUPERINTENDANCE OF O & M EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL O & M EXPENDITURES AND SQUARE FOOTAGE

	Expenditu	Expenditures from state appropriated funds	oriated funds	Expo	Expenditures from all funds	
	Actual FY1992	Per \$1,000 O & M	Per Non- Residential	Actual FY1992	Per \$1,000 O & M	Per Total Square
	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Square Foot	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Foot
Board of Governors	\$ 1,319.4	\$43	\$0.24	\$ 1,497.4	\$ 32	\$0.16
Chicago State University	193.1	37	0.28	218.0	36	0.26
Eastern Illinois University	292.1	43	0.21	373.5	26	0.13
Governors State University	201.9	56	0.44	203.2	54	0.43
Northeastern Illinois University	198.6	33	0.22	198.7	27	0.19
Western Illinois University	433.7	50	0.22	504.0	33	0.12
Board of Regents	1,224.1	42	0.22	1,283.4	23	0.11
Illinois State University	522.3	37	0.21	548.8	19	0.10
Northern Illinois University	568.0	46	0.22	568.0	22	0.10
Sangamon State University	133.8	49	0.26	166.6	55	0.24
Southern Illinois University	756.0	27	0.15	1,048.4	23	0.11
Carbondale	367.7	18	0.11	660.1	18	0.09
Edwardsville	388.3	47	0.26	388.3	38	0.17
University of Illinois	2,861.2	28	0.17	6,985.2	41	0.29
Chicago	1,941.9	38	0.27	2,041.0	25	0.23
Urbana-Champaign	919.3	19	0.09	4,944.3	54	0.33
Total	\$ 6,160.7	\$33	\$0.18	\$ 10,814.5	\$34	\$0.20



\$: **D**

Table 6B

CUSTODIAL EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL O & M EXPENDITURES AND SQUARE FOOTAGE

	Expenditu	Expenditures from state appropriated funds	riated funds	EX	Expenditures from all funds	\$
	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per Non-	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per Total
	FY1992	0 & M	Residential	FY1992	O&M	Square
	(in,000s)	Expenditures	Square Foot	(in,000s)	Expenditures	Foot
Board of Governors	\$ 5,513.8	\$181	\$1.00	\$ 10,322.8	\$ 219	\$1.07
Chicago State University	1,008.8	, 191	1.44	1,124.5	188	1.32
Eastern Illinois University	1,398.1	206	0.99	3,713.3	256	1.26
Governors State University	366.6	102	0.80	406.2	108	0.86
Northeastern Illinois University	1,054.7	173	1.16	1,321.6	179	1.25
Western Illinois University	1,685.6	195	0.84	3,757.2	244	0.87
Board of Regents	5,379.3	184	0.95	11,169.1	196	0.97
Illinois State University	2,579.1	183	1.02	5,722.6	203	1.08
Northern Illinois University	2,218.2	179	0.84	4,864.5	190	0.89
Sangamon State University	582.0	211	1.11	582.0	192	0.86
Southern Illinois University	5,133.6	181	1.03	8,077.8	175	0.87
Carbondale	3,876.6	194	1.12	6,820.8	190	76.0
Edwardsville	1,257.0	152	0.84	1,257.0	123	0.55
University of Illinois	13,689.5	136	0.80	29,322.8	171	1.23
Chicago	6,816.5	132	96.0	14,607.0	182	1.67
Urbana-Champaign	6,873.0	139	0.68	14,715.7	161	0.97
Total	\$ 29,716.2	\$157	\$0.89	\$ 58,892.5	\$183	\$1.09



Table 6C

REPAIRS, MAINTENANCE, AND GROUNDS MAINTENANCE EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL O & M EXPENDITURES AND SQUARE FOOTAGE

	Expenditu	Expenditures from state appropriated funds	iated funds	Exp	Expenditures from all funds	
	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per Non-	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per Total
	FY1992	O&M	Residential	FY1992	O & M	Square
	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Square Foot	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Foot
Board of Governors	\$ 5,852.5	\$193	\$1.06	\$ 9,966.7	\$212	\$1.04
Chicago State University	764.7	145	1.10	875.7	146	1.03
Eastern Illinois University	1,264.9	187	0.89	3,228.7	222	1.10
Governors State University	784.6	218	1.72	834.9	223	1.77
Northeastern Illinois University	1,223.9	201	1.34	1,260.7	170	1.19
Western Illinois University	1,814.4	210	0.90	3,766.7	244	0.87
Board of Regents	5,898.1	202	1.04	15,773.5	277	1.38
Illinois State University	2,722.8	193	1.07	7,611.1	270	1.44
Northern Illinois University	2,469.3	199	0.94	7,390.1	288	1.35
Sangamon State University	706.0	256	1.35	772.3	255	1.14
Southern Illinois University	5,392.6	191	1.09	10,403.3	225	1.12
Cartondale	4,252.4	212	1.23	8,891.3	247	1.27
Edw. rdsville	1,140.2	138	0.76	1,512.0	148	99.0
University of Illinois	21,522.9	213	1.25	56,913.8	331	2.39
Chicago	8,158.6	158	1.15	20,154.1	252	2.31
Urbana-Champaign	13,364.3	271	1.32	36,759.6	401	2.43
Total	\$ 38,666.1	\$205	\$1.16	\$ 93,057.2	\$289	\$1.72



433

Table 6D

UTILITY SUPPORT EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL O & M EXPENDITURES, SQUARE FOOTAGE, AND UTILITY PRODUCTION EXPENDITURES

	Expe	Expenditures from state appropriated funds	e appropriated fi	nnds		Expenditures from all funds	all funds	
	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per Non-	Per Utility	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per Total	Per Utility
	FY1992	O&M	Kesidential	Production	FY1952	W % O	Square	Production
	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Square Foot	Dollar	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Foot	Dollar
Board of Governors	\$ 4,049.7	\$133	\$0.74	\$0.49	\$ 4,896.9	\$104	\$0.51	\$0.38
Chicago State University	889.2	169	1.27	0.72	982.1	164	1.15	0.72
Eastern Illinois University	1,021.3	151	0.72	0.49	1,525.9	105	0.52	0.37
Governors State University	665.4	185	1.46	0.61	691.9	185	1.47	0.64
Northeastem Illinois University	1,022.5	168	1.12	0.63	1,066.7	144	1.01	0.61
Western Illinois University	451.3	52	0.22	0.20	630.3	41	0.15	0.14
Board of Regents	2,829.7	97	0.50	0.31	3,876.3	89	0.34	0.26
Illinois State University	1,673.4	119	99.0	0.42	2,144.0	76	0.41	0.32
Northern Illinois University	1,046.0	84	0.40	0.24	1,622.0	63	0.30	0.21
Sangamon State University	110.3	40	0.21	0.15	110.3	36	0.16	0.14
Southern Illinois University	2,717.1	<u>36</u>	0.55	0.30	4,060.5	88	0.44	0.30
Carbondale	1,492.3	75	0.43	0.23	2,780.9	7.1	0.40	0.27
Edwardsville	1,224.8	148	0.82	0.47	1,279.6	125	0.56	0.37
University of Illinois	14,252.6	141	0.83	0.39	17,586.0	102	0.74	0.41
Chi go	9,406.4	182	1.33	0.48	12,539.9	156	1.44	0.57
Urbana-Champaign	4,846.2	86	0.48	0.29	5.046.1	55	0.33	0.24
Total	\$ 23,849.1	\$126	\$0.72	\$0.38	\$ 30,419.7	\$6\$	\$0.56	\$0.36

Table 6E

SECURITY AND FIRE PROTECTION EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL O & M EXPENDITURES AND SQUARE FOOTAGE

	Expenditur	Expenditures from state appropriated funds	iated funds	Exp	Expenditures from all funds	
	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per Non-	Actual	Per \$1,000	Per Total
	FY1992	0 & M	Residential	FY1992	0 & M	Square
	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Square Foot	(in ,000s)	Expenditures	Foot
Board of Governors	\$ 3,283.1	\$108	\$0.60	\$ 4,391.2	\$93	\$0.46
Chicago State University	752.0	143	1.08	768.7	128	0.00
Eastern Illinois University	511.4	75	0.36	1,194.2	82	0.41
Governors State University	476.2	133	1.05	478.6	128	1.02
Northeastern Illinois University	670.0	110	0.74	867.1	117	0.82
Western Illinois University	873.5	101	0.43	1,082.6	70	0.25
Board of Regents	2,588.3	88	0.46	2,973.3	52	0.26
Illinois State University	1,180.3	84	0.47	1,180.6	42	0.22
Northern Illinois University	1,144.4	92	0.44	1,482.7	58	0.27
Sangamon State University	263.6	96	0.50	310.0	102	0.46
Southern Illinois University	3,996.4	141	0.80	4,296.6	93	0.46
Carbondale	2,649.0	132	0.76	2,839.5	42	0.40
Edwardsville	1,347.4	163	06'0	1,457.1	143	0.64
University of Illinois	7,445.2	74	0.43	9,134.5	53	0.38
Chicago	3,993.3	77	0.56	4,776.8	09	0.55
Urbana-Champaign	3,451.9	70	0.34	4,357.7	84	0.29
Total	\$ 17,313.0	\$92	\$0.52	\$ 20,795.6	\$65	\$0.38



APPENDIX

ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORT FUNCTIONS DEFINITIONS

Definitions for the individual activities in each of the four functional areas are provided below. Examples of activities included in each subprogram also are provided.

Activities That Support the Institutions' Academic Missions

Activities that support the institutions' academic mission are carried out in direct support of the primary functions of instruction, research, and public service.

<u>Departmental Administration and Personnel Development</u>. Activities include those that provide administrative support and management direction to those programs and activities classified as instruction. Examples of activities included within this subprogram category are: departmental chairpersons, associated departmental personnel, recruiting, sabbaticals, travel, equipment, commodities, departmental retreats, and advising.

<u>Library Services</u>. This subprogram includes those activities that directly support the collection, cataloging, storage, and distribution of published materials that support one or more of the institution's primary functions. Library administration is included here.

Academic Administration. This subprogram includes administrative support and management activities specifically for the support of an institution's primary programs of instruction, organized research, and public service. College deans and associated personnel, faculty senates, faculty recruitment, and other types of personnel development programs assigned to the college level all are examples of activities to be included in this subprogram.

<u>Faculty and Staff Auxiliary Services</u>. This subprogram includes those support services that have been established primarily to serve the faculty and staff such as faculty lounges, faculty cafeterias or faculty centers providing a variety of services.

Museums and Galleries. This subprogram includes those activities related to the collection, presentation, and exhibition of historical materials, art objects, scientific displays, and so forth, that support one or more of the institution's primary functional programs.

Academic Support Not Elsewhere Classified. This subprogram includes all remaining activities whose objective is to support the three primary programs of Instruction, Organized Research, and Public Service. An example of an activity to be placed in this subprogram is an institution's University Press.

Activities That Provide Services To Students

The Student Service Program includes those activities carried out to facilitate students' educational objectives as well as contribute to the emotional and physical well-being of the students and to the intellectual, cultural, and social development outside the context of the institution's formal instructional activities.

Admissions, Registration and Records. This subprogram includes activities carried out by the institution related to 1) identification of prospective students, 2) promotion of attendance at the institution, 3) processing of applications for admission to the institution, and 4) maintenance, handling and updating of records for students currently enrolled. Examples of activities included in this subprogram are: recruiting trips, communication with high schools, student record maintenance.



-31- 51

correspondence related to student records, interviewing student applicants, and evaluation of student applicants.

Social and Cultural Development. Activities established to provide for the social and cultural development of the student outside the formal academic program are classified into this subprogram. It includes those activities supported and controlled primarily by the student body, those activities outside the student's educational experience, and general recreation activities for the student body. Intercollegiate athletics are excluded.

Counseling and Career Services. This subprogram includes formal placement, career guidance, and personal counseling services provided for the benefit of students. Activities to be included are those related to personal and disciplinary counseling, and vocational testing and counseling, as well as those activities carried out to assist students in obtaining employment upon leaving the institution.

Student Health/Medical Services. This subprogram includes activities carried out for the specific purpose of providing health and medical services for the student body. The activities included in this subprogram are generally associated with a student infirmary rather than a teaching hospital.

Financial Assistance. All financial assistance provided to undergraduate students in the form of outright grants, trainee stipends, prizes awarded by the university or through the university, and matching funds for student loan programs (i.e., National Direct Student Loan Program) are reported in this subprogram. Resources required to replace revenues due to the waiver of student fees are reported in this subprogram. Often student fee waivers are granted to students who are awarded statutory tuition waivers. Institutional loan programs are not reported as a part of this functional subprogram.

<u>Financial Aid Administration</u>. This subprogram includes administrative activities carried out in support of an institution's financial aid program.

Student Service Administration. This subprogram includes those administrative activities that provide assistance and support, excluding academic support, to the needs and interests of students. This subprogram includes only those administrative activities that support more than one subprogram within Student Services Activities and/or provide central administrative services related to various student service activities.

Activities That Provide Institution-wide Management and Support

This area includes those activities carried out to provide for both the day-to-day functioning as well as the long-range viability of the university as an operating organization. The overall objective is to provide for the institution's organizational effectiveness and continuity.

Executive Management. This subprogram consists of those executive level activities concerned with the overall management of, and long-range planning for, the entire institution. Included within this subprogram are the activities of the various participants involved in policy formulation and executive direction, including the activities of the governing board, the chief executive officer, and the senior executive officers.

<u>Financial Management and Operations</u>. This subprogram consists of those activities related to the day-to-day financial management and fiscal operations of the institution.

General Administration and Logistical Services. This subprogram consists of those activities related to the general administrative operations and services of the institution with the exception of those activities related to financial operations and to student records. Included in this subprogram are 1)



the administration of personnel programs, 2) the purchasing and maintenance of supplies and materials, 3) management of the institution's facilities, and 4) administrative computing support.

<u>Public Relations/Development</u>. This subprogram consists of those institutional activities established to maintain relations with the local community, the institution's alumni, governmental entities, and the public in general, as well as those activities carried out to support institution-wide fund raising and development efforts.

Operations and Maintenance of the Physical Plant

This area consists of those activities related to maintaining existing grounds and facilities, providing utility services, campus security and fire protection, transportation, and rental of space.

<u>Superintendence</u>. All activities necessary to carry out the duties of management and administration for all areas under the jurisdiction of the physical plant division of the university are included in this functional subprogram.

<u>Custodial Services</u>. All activities related to custodial services in building interiors are reported as Custodial Services.

Repairs and Maintenance. This subprogram includes all activities and costs which are required to perform routine repair of buildings, related equipment, structures, and appurtenances including normal recurring repairs, and preventive maintenance.

Grounds Maintenance. Grounds maintenance includes operation and maintenance of campus landscape and grounds.

<u>Utility Production</u>. This functional category includes the contractual costs for purchasing electricity, natural gas, water, and sewage treatment services. It also includes the cost of primary fuel sources such as coal and fuel oil used in the production of heat, light, and power.

<u>Utility Support</u>. Activities included in this subprogram are those related to the operation and maintenance of heating and air conditioning plants; utility distribution systems, and maintenance, operation and replacement of the necessary equipment to support utility production.

<u>Permanent Improvements</u>. This subprogram includes those activities and costs, funded with operating funds, which improve property or replace an item which has surpassed its estimated useful life. The activities are classified as nonrecurring.

<u>Security</u>. Police needed to secure the physical plant of the university, to enforce law and order on the university campus and to control campus traffic are reported in this functional subprogram. The costs reported under Security should include personnel, equipment and supplies.

<u>Fire Protection</u>. Fire protection included activities and costs which provide fire protection services for the university campus. In some cases a university maintains its own fire department while in other cases the university contracts with a municipality for fire protection services.

<u>Transportation</u>. Transportation includes all activities related to the purchase, maintenance, and operation of motor vehicles specifically for the use of the physical plant department.

Other Unclassified O and M Activities. All Operation and Maintenance of Physical Plant activities which do not fit any of the above described categories are classified in this category.

