

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 433 860

JC 980 357

AUTHOR Tollefson, Terrence A.
TITLE Comparisons between the State Share of Community College Operating Budgets and State Centralization of Control in Eleven State Community College Systems.
PUB DATE 1997-08-29
NOTE 7p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Budgeting; *Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; *Governance; *Government School Relationship; Operating Expenses; Resource Allocation; School District Spending; *State Aid; *State Regulation; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

This paper describes studies by Fonte (1993), Garrett (1992-93), and Ingram and Tollefson (1996) regarding state funding and control of community colleges. This article compares each of the three studies and contrasts the results. All research was based on questionnaires returned by 44 state directors of community colleges. Garrett concluded that state systems funded by more than 50 percent of state funds tend to have centralized governance structures, and those funded by local funds greater than 25 percent tend to have decentralized governance structures. Fonte's three primary conclusions were concerned with the effects of various state financial regulations on a college's ability to fulfill local needs for economic development, access, and "community resident programming." Ingram and Tollefson found that effective decision making in community colleges exists primarily at the local level. A table displays state shares of community college operating budgets, compared to state centralization of control, as perceived by each of the three studies. The article concludes that, based partly on the information provided by these studies, other political factors and traditions are more important determinants of state control over community colleges than the proportion of operating support provided by the state. (AS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Comparisons between the State Share of Community College Operating Budgets and State Centralization of Control in Eleven State Community College Systems

Terrence A. Tollefson

East Tennessee State University

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

This document has been reproduced as received 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 AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terrence A. Tollefson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

980 357



**Comparisons Between the State Share of Community College Operating Budgets
and State Centralization of Control
in Eleven State Community College Systems**

**Terrence A. Tollefson
August 29, 1997**

The conventional wisdom in recent years has equated the proportion of community college funds appropriated by each state legislature with the proportion of state control over local community college decisions (Fonte, 1993). Studies by Garrett (1992 and 1993), Fonte (1993) and Ingram & Tollefson (1996) support the conventional wisdom, but with some qualifications

Garrett's studies (1992 and 1993) were based on completed questionnaires returned by 44 state directors of community colleges, and Fonte (1993) and Ingram & Tollefson (1996) used the same sources. Fonte received responses from 49 states, but published an analysis of only 19 large state community college systems. Garrett and Ingram & Tollefson developed weighted composite constructs of state centralization, but Fonte did not. Garrett and Ingram & Tollefson's studies employed numerical weights that permitted deriving rank orders, but Fonte grouped states into three categories (highest, mid-range and lowest in state control). Garrett's studies emphasized state statutory authority. Ingram & Tollefson employed the concept of effective decision-making authority, meaning the level at which decisions made were not usually reversed at a higher level. Fonte emphasized state financial regulations of community colleges. Garrett's 1993 study is used in this paper as the source of state shares of operating support.

Garrett (1993) concluded, "....state systems funded by more than 50% of state funds tend to have centralized governance structures, and state systems funded by local funds greater than 25% tend to have decentralized governance structures (pp. 12-13)."

Fonte did not attempt to relate funding to control, except in citing the conclusions of earlier authors, but rather was more concerned with the effects of various state financial regulations on the colleges' ability to fulfill local needs for economic development, access and "community resident programming." His conclusions include the following:

- "...higher levels of Business Community Programming are achieved by states with the lowest levels of regulation (p. 8)."
- No significant relationships were found between degrees of state regulation and access or community resident programming (p. 11).
- "The study results suggest that at the very time that states are urging institutions to become major actors in economic development in their local customized training, they may be either establishing or maintaining fiscal regulatory policies that hamper close cooperation between local institutions and local businesses (p. 12)".

Ingram & Tollefson concluded:

- "The results of this study strongly indicate that heads of state community college systems perceive the location of effective decision making in community colleges in their states to be at the local level (p. 143)".
- "A possible explanation for differences between the results of this study and the suggestions in other studies that local governance authority is diminishing may be found in the distinction drawn here between *effective* decision-making authority and *formal* decision-making authority. These results may reflect an assumption in the operation of state community college systems that decisions are effectively

made at the local level without regard for the final or formal decision-making agent. Leaders of state community college systems may perceive the role of the state agency as that of a 'rubber stamp', formally approving the decisions or actions of the local colleges (p. 148)".

The table below displays state shares of operating support for community colleges from Garrett (1993), and rank orders of state centralization indexes by Garrett (1992) and Ingram & Tollefson (1996), and high/medium/low categorizations of state financial regulatory control by Fonte (1993). Rank orders were derived from index numbers, and they pertain only to the 10 states for which case studies were written, plus Arizona, as shown in the left column of the table.

State Shares of Community College Operating Budgets Compared to State Centralization of Control

State	Garrett (1993)		Garrett (1992)	Ingram & Tollefson (1996)	Fonte (1993)
	State Share %	Rank (N=10)	State Centralization Rank (N=10)	State Centralization Rank (N=10)	State Centralization Category (N=9)
Arizona	24.0	10	5	3	Low
California	77.5	3	4	9	Medium
Colorado	75.0	4	1	1	Medium
Florida	100.0	1	8	7	Medium
Michigan	38.7	6	10	10	Low
Nebraska	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	Low
New Jersey	28.0	8	6	2	N.A.
Oregon	30.0	7	9	8	Low
Texas	51.0	5	7	4	Low
Washington	90.0	2	3	6	High
Wisconsin	25.0	9	2	5	N.A.

The table indicates some relationship between state share of community colleges operating support and the degree of state centralization of control, but by no means a perfect correlation. Arizona is depicted as a state system with more state control than might be expected based on the 24% state share of operating support. Michigan is shown with less state control than would be expected for a state with a 39% state share, and Florida community colleges appear to have much more local autonomy than would be expected in a system with no local operating support.

Based upon these studies and the 10 state case studies developed, it seems reasonable to conclude that other political factors and traditions, are more important determinants of state control of community colleges than the proportion of operating support provided by the state. Such factors include, but are not limited to, the type of state-level board, whether governors and legislators have confidence in community colleges regarding whether the community colleges are perceived as providing effective college transfer programs and, particularly, the degree to which community colleges are viewed as strong and efficient contributors to workforce training and economic development.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4

6

REFERENCES

- Fonte, R. W. (1993). The impact of state financing and regulation on the local orientation of community colleges. *Community College Review*, 21(1), 4-14.
- Garrett, R.L. (1992). Degree of centralization of state community college systems in the United States, 1990. *Community College Review*. 20(1), 7-13.
- Garrett, R.L. A profile of state community college system characteristics and their relationship to degrees of centralization. *Community College Review*. 20(5), 6-15.
- Ingram, W.G. & Tollefson, T.A., (1996). Local autonomy is alive and well: The results of a national study on locations of effective decision-making authority in state community college systems. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 20(2), 133-150.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Comparisons between the State Share of Community College Operating Budgets and State Centralization of Control in Eleven State Community College Systems
Author(s): Tollefson, Terry
Corporate Source:
Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS).

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sample
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sample
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2A

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sample
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
2B

Level 1

Input box with checkmark

Level 2A

Input box

Level 2B

Input box

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, ->

Signature: Tollefson, Terry
Printed Name/Position/Title: Professor, Ed. Leaders Grp
Organization/Address: East Tennessee State University, Box 70550, Johnson City TN 37614
Telephone: 423-439-7617
FAX: 423-439-7636
E-Mail Address: tollefs@etsu.edu
Date: 10-5-99



III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080

Toll Free: 800-799-3742

FAX: 301-953-0263

e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov

WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)