Title

An Examination of Government Relations Offices and State Funding

Authors

Randall W. Brumfield, EdD
Director of Undergraduate Student Services
College of Business Administration
University of Central Florida
4000 Central Florida Blvd.
Orlando, FL 32816
(407) 823-2987
rbrumfield@bus.ucf.edu

Michael T. Miller, EdD
Professor and Head
Department of Rehabilitation, Human Resources, and Communication Disorders
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701
(479) 575-3582
FAX: (479) 575-3319
mtmille@uark.edu

Jennifer M. Miles, EdD
Assistant Professor, Higher Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, AR 72701
(479) 575-4188
jmmiles@uark.edu

Document Date

May 27, 2009

Abstract

With soaring uncertainty surrounding the financing of public higher education, institutions are faced with developing strategies that will enable them to effectively compete for state funding. One component to cultivating resources and relationships for colleges and universities are through government relations organizations. Utilized for developing rapport with political leaders and policy decision-makers, these groups are relied upon to prioritize higher education among the agendas of elected and appointed officials. As a result, the study examined the size of government relations offices serving major land-grant institutions, and, provided an analysis of the job responsibilities shared among personnel. In turn, findings were compared with levels of state funding corresponding to institutions participating in the research. Although the purpose of the study was to draw inferences concerning the effectiveness of personnel composition within these government relations groups, the overarching goal was to help establish a foundation for further exploration -- and explanation -- on higher education's involvement with government relations.

An Examination of Government Relations Offices and State Funding

As public funding for state colleges and universities declines (Potter, 2003), it is imperative that institutions maximize internal resources to generate revenue. One area for innovation is the structure of government relations offices. Given their responsibility for communicating to policymakers the need for public investment in higher education, government relations personnel play a key role in developing financial support. The number of staff employed in an office combined with the assignment of specific responsibilities offer integral variables to be considered by administrators when developing a government relations strategy. With the scramble for public resources becoming increasingly competitive among public institutions of higher learning, it is advisable for colleges and universities to implement creative and efficient measures allowing for meaningful and effective relationship-building with legislators (Quillian, 2005).

Competing demands for state resources will continue to take its toll on available funding for higher education (Jones, 2003; Kane & Orszag, 2003). With the demand for public resources soaring, states will be forced to make difficult decisions concerning allocations to publicly-financed colleges. Increased funding for K-12 reforms, Medicaid claims, infrastructure improvements, and civil defense equates to smaller shares of states' general funds left for postsecondary institutions (Trombley, 2003). Not helping matters, public perception generally views higher education as a consumer product; therefore, it is widely believed funding should be provided largely by those who directly subscribe to its services (Harvey & Immerwahr, 1995). Confirmed by Melton (2002), higher education leaders are charged with a rigorous challenge to persuade lawmakers that higher education is a viable expenditure in light of vying interests and less than favorable public opinion.

The purpose for conducting the study was to determine the extent a relationship exists between personnel structure in university government relations offices and the share of state funding an institution receives. The study centered on major public research universities designated as peer institutions by the University of Arkansas. Specifically, personnel size and job functions correspondent to government relations offices within these institutions were the focus of the research.

Background of the Study

Observed by Cook (2004), the Republican Party, upon taking control of Congress in 1995:

> On the stump and in publications… sought to distance themselves from the academic community and contributed to the erosion of public confidence in it. As the new Republican leadership drew its line in the sand, the [higher education] community realized that its [low key and non-aggressive lobbying] approach would have to change. (p. 55)

With Congressional representatives distrusting academia, and state legislators and the public increasingly perceiving higher education as more a "personal investment than a public good" (Malveaux, 2004, p. 31) and as a "private benefit rather than a broader social good" (Zusman, 2005, p. 231), higher education officials were left to develop a strategy that would increase public support and address the rising demand for financial access by disadvantaged populations.

With tax revenue allocations considered as a standard of measurement reflecting the level of public support towards maintaining a "highly diverse system of higher education" (Johnstone, 2005, p. 373), elected officials and education leaders are more aggressively articulating the importance of reinvesting or redistributing public resources to state colleges. "College and university leaders who once spent the fall overseeing the start of the new academic year instead hit the campaign trail this season, promoting bond packages, scholarship support and budget issues" (Melton, 2002, p. 31). This is indicative of reformed behavior on the part of academics,

observed George Mason Public Affairs Professor Toni-Michelle Travis, noting that college administrators "believe they must obviously and visibly support funding for higher education… [taking] for granted that the public understands where the money for higher education comes from, not any longer" (Melton, 2002, p. 31). This new attitude has paid off, as electorates have been persuaded to preserve or increase funding in various states. For instance, voters in California and Virginia approved bonds that include financing higher education, while citizens in Massachusetts and Arkansas chose to sustain current state tax rates, and a plurality in Michigan decided to continue investing a portion of tobacco settlement money in public institutions (Melton, 2002). Hebel and Selingo (2001) also pointed to the efforts made by Wisconsin and Ohio administrators to place a new spin on successful college budget requests, opting to frame them as economic stimulus investments.

Despite this creativity, though, higher education administrators in some states remain facing tough political realities when tackling funding issues. For instance, despite Virginia's bond provision, Smith (2004) highlighted the state's tax-cutting agenda which could ultimately offset the gains made by the Commonwealth's bond initiative. He also pointed to Colorado's move to shift higher education funding through secondary accounts and discretionary spending. Such politically expedient decisions to cut state spending serve as significant factors for declining state revenue, and eventually, reduced financing for public colleges and universities. In the wake of what was expected to be the largest high school senior class from the nation's public schools in 2008, states struggled to fund public services as a result of unstable tax policies and stagnant economic growth. Given these conditions and a lack of increased federal student assistance, state and local institutions are resigned to raising student tuition rates and fees in lieu of public scrutiny.

Aside from the efforts of many elected officials to minimize post-secondary allocations as a point of emphasis in fiscal budgets, the aforementioned strategies are brief examples of policies implemented to actively achieve a common goal: to help establish the financing of higher education as a priority for state governments. Most fundamental of the logic to do so is the need to produce an educated workforce that will contribute to society – and the economy (National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2004). Not only can an educated workforce lead to decreased criminal activity and entitlement claims, the tax revenue generated by college graduates reimburses their education costs several times over (National Education Association Higher Education Research Center, 2003). As a result investments in public institutions can indirectly reduce the costs associated with prison funding, welfare, and other public assistance programs, while also contributing to state commerce. Believing that the role of higher education can promote the development "of human capital essential to state and local economic development and workforce needs," the American Association of State Colleges and Universities agrees that administrators should take a larger role in statewide planning (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2006, p. 33).

Furthermore, it has been recommended that policymakers should be made aware that private giving, statistically, cannot replace the void left by budget cuts. The perception exists among lawmakers that colleges and universities can adequately replace lost dollars by turning to charitable revenue; however, research suggests that donors will limit their giving if it is perceived such gifts are replacing state funding (Gianneschi, 2004). Incidentally, increases and decreases in state funding often act as predictors for private funding. In short, when appropriations increase, donations increase (and vice verse). Statistical evidence indicates donors prefer to make contributions to institutions that are allocated large state appropriations, but

changes in giving occur when state funding fluctuates (Gianneschi, 2004). Unfortunately, to the dismay of college administrators this trend seems to lack saliency among legislators when deciding on a budget.

Elected officials as well as the general public should recognize higher education's importance to society, its contributions, and the significance of an educated population in the management of a free and democratic society (Quillian, 2005). It is also critical for elected officials to recognize specific segments of society (aspiring for a college education) continue to face hurdles such as poverty and racial discrimination. Thus, these barriers often make it difficult and/or impossible to succeed in the academic arena. If the promise of education in American society is to be fulfilled, it is essential that factors beyond the academy be continually addressed. Wellman (2002) touched on the importance of the nation and its individual states to make this investment. Conveying the historical and future impact the national economy will continue to leave on the state level, Wellman correlated the economic decline following 9/11 with the fiscal pressure applied to public institutions. The "double whammy" to which he referred concerns the decline in public revenue coupled with the increasing matriculation at public institutions. The ability to keep pace with facilitating quality academic service, technological advances, and growing demands on personnel is a challenge that must be met with creative and innovative academic, budget, and organizational planning.

As challenging as it may seem, it is essential that the higher education community remain sensitive to (and understanding of) the competing demands that policy makers face. Sensitivity and understanding, however, do not necessarily result in resignation. Colleges and universities are finding themselves in a position to remain diligent toward ensuring that the competencies and contributions of a post-secondary education are fully understood by the public and policymakers.

Quillian (2005) noted this, suggesting that a concentrated effort to provide compelling evidence of both the personal benefits and the societal good higher education outcomes have to offer is critical to earning the trust and understanding of both the general public and policymakers. The higher education community must look critically at its own practices and traditions and embrace changes that not only maintain stability of mission, but also improve the quality of service, while controlling the cost of the educational experience. This will require collaborative efforts of accrediting agencies, governing boards, administrators and faculty members.

In lieu of these efforts, the importance of communicating higher education's message is not solely for the benefit of public funding, but also the necessary policy changes that will enable and empower institutions to rely less on state government oversight and spending. Observed by Potter (2003), the trend in state governments across the country has been to cut funding for higher education. Although 18 states were able to increase their higher education budget in 2002, the nation experienced an average of a 5% drop in state higher education appropriations. To circumvent this issue higher education leaders are agreeing to raise private revenue in exchange for greater autonomy to enact and enforce policies with reduced state oversight. Budget cuts continue to affect students in the pocketbook and in the classroom as colleges seek to find new ways to grow revenue through such means as cutting programs, reducing full-time faculty, and relying more on technology to provide academic and non-academic student services.

In responding to the evolving needs of higher education, legislators and administrators are increasingly considering this move to delegate regulatory authority from government oversight to individual campuses. Oversight of tuition rates, admissions requirements, curriculum demands, and institutional accountability are several key responsibilities slowly shifting to the responsibility of college administrators.

> The clear trend of the past several years has been toward granting greater independence to individual institutions and relying less on central authority. This devolutionary process has been driven by... frustration with governing systems, and a widespread belief that decentralization, deregulation, and a free-market approach would be more effective. (MacTaggart, 2004, p. 31)

As institutions engage in this competition for more dollars, the most meaningful change occurring may be found in their growing ability to set tuition rates. Given that legislatures are cutting taxes and limiting spending on health care programs and prison funding, institutions have little choice but to raise tuition in exchange for fewer state funds (National Education Association Higher Education Research Center, 2003).

Although many campus presidents desire to retain oversight responsibilities of tuition rates, bond initiatives, and business partnerships to sustain academic quality, legislators and student groups worry that such authority could lead to consistent price hikes and less accountability (Hebel, 2003). Ironically, fiscal policy decisions rendered by political leaders are enabling institutions to deviate from their public mission to provide an accessible and quality education. As Zemsky (2003) noted, “the willingness of legislatures to encourage tuition increases in place of state appropriations... has helped privatize public higher education” (p. B8).

Depending on perspective, legislatures have created for themselves either an opportunity to capitalize on, or, a political dilemma to contend with. In exchanging budget oversight for reduced public funding, there remains no clear course of action politicians are willing to adopt.

> At the state level, many states are demanding greater and more detailed accountability of diminishing state revenues... even as other states are considering reducing controls in exchange for reduced state appropriations (Zusman, 2005, p. 123).

On the other end of the autonomy spectrum, however, legislation has also been introduced that penalizes public institutions who raise tuition costs at a rate exceeding inflation. Ehrenberg (2004) was careful not to endorse this action, reasoning that lawmakers fail to understand that

state funding allocated to institutions has declined significantly (over 30%) throughout the last 25 years. With states allocating a larger portion of their budgets to comply with federal K-12 mandates and Medicaid obligations, institutions are relying more on need-based student aid while expecting less from public funding. As a result the decrease in state support has led to increased attendance costs, fewer research opportunities, and fewer tenure-track faculty positions.

This reality means higher tuition for students as states' priorities shift to other programs such as Medicare (Manzo, 2006), while public attention (saliency) remains focused on K-12 education, as opposed to postsecondary opportunities (Ward, 2004). Admittedly, there exists some dissent in the higher education community concerning the restriction of such opportunities as the most pressing issue within academic and student affairs circles.

For example, Hicock (2006) argued:

> Access to college is not the main problem. Success is. The retention rate for low-income and minority students at many institutions is much lower than for their peers; they get into college but they don't complete their education. (p. B48)

However, despite the attention academics and administrators may call to the importance of academic and student support programs, the issue of insufficient postsecondary financing remains. As Ikenberry (2001) pointed out, a quarter-century ago students in the lowest family income bracket receiving the maximum Pell award required approximately 6 percent of family income to attend a publicly funded institution; conversely, these same families in the 21st century must now invest over a third of their earnings in college attendance costs. Until effective efforts are made to increase funding for student aid as well as higher education operations, the issue of access will continue to be the centerpiece of the decline in favorable public perception and inevitably political support.

Research Methods

Survey administration was the method of research selected for data collection. The survey instrument was developed to retrieve information focusing on the number of individuals serving in a government relations office as well as the duties performed by such personnel. The survey provided multiple choice options through which questions could be answered; however, space was allowed for participants to provide for further clarification of their responses if applicable. Specifically, the inquiries prompted respondents to indicate the number of full-time and part-time professional and administrative personnel responsible for federal, state, and/or local government relations duties. Toward ensuring accuracy, relevance, and demographics of the data respondents were asked to indicate the institution they represent, the institution's association, if any, with external representation (contracted lobbyists), and the constituent represented by the government relations office (institution, university system, or otherwise).

Fifty-five institutions were selected for the online survey. The population was drawn from the list of peer institutions provided in the University of Arkansas strategic plan (University of Arkansas 2010 Commission, 2001). These institutions were all leading land-grant universities or similarly focused A lead government relations official from each institution was contacted via electronic mail to complete the survey. Exactly 30 respondents chose to complete the survey request.

The survey was designed to answer five research questions. The first question addressed the organizational structure of government relations offices. The second question examined the correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and the share of a state's budget an institution receives. In question three, relationships were analyzed as it concerned the organizational structure of a government relations office and the share of a total state's budget the institution receives. Questions four and five follow the patterns of questions two and three;

however, the dependent variable is modified to examine the share of state higher education budgets allocated to institutions (rather than shares of overall state budgets).

Findings

The first question was intended to determine the organizational structures of government relations offices in major public research institutions. Based on the information provided, a typical government relations office represents an individual institution as opposed to a university system. Additionally, it retains both state and federal relations responsibilities while employing slightly less than six staff members. This usually consists of four professionals and two office support staff members. Of the four professionals, two are responsible for carrying out state relations duties. However, nearly half of professional and administrative staff is responsible for fulfilling only state relations duties.

The second research question inquired as to the extent a correlation exists between the personnel size of a government relations office and its institution's appropriation as a percentage of the state general fund. Using a Pearson product-moment correlation analysis, results concluded that a negative correlation exists between the two variables. Statistically, the percentage of a state’s general fund allocated to an institution increases as the personnel size of a government relations office decreases. However, the analysis also concluded the data does not support the likelihood of a causal relationship. These trends hold true for associated variables. The percentage of funding received maintains a negative statistical correlation with not only the total number of overall staff, but also total staff performing state relations functions and total staff performing only state relations functions.

The third research question intended to determine the extent to which a correlation exists between the organizational structure of a government relations office and its institution’s share of

the state's budget. Again, using a Pearson product-moment correlation analysis a negative correlation and a weak causal relationship is observed. The percentage of a state's budget devoted to an institution is larger for institutions who maintain smaller numbers of specific personnel. In further detail, the percentage of funding (proportional to state budgets) maintains a negative correlation with the following variables: professional staff, support staff, professional staff performing state relations functions, and professional staff performing only state relations duties.

The fourth research question examined the correlation between the personnel size of a government relations office and the percentage of a state's higher education budget allocated to its institution. Consistent with results from the previous research questions, the correlation is negative and the strength of relationship between the variables is nearly non-existent. Parallel with the second research question the share of a state's higher education budget is increased, statistically, for government relations offices that not only maintain smaller staff sizes, but also maintain less staff performing state relations functions as well as less staff performing only state relations functions.

The fifth and final research question sought to address the correlation between the organizational structure of a government relations office and the percentage of a state's higher education budget allocated to its institution. Unlike the previous three research questions, it appears that a positive correlation is calculated when analyzing one of the variables tested. Although a negative correlation exists when performing an analysis concerning the total number of professional staff, support staff, and professional staff performing only state relations duties, a positive correlation occurs when factoring the total number of professional staff engaging in state relations duties. Thus, statistically, a higher percentage of state higher education budgets are

awarded to institutions who maintain a larger professional staff assisting with state relations responsibilities. Nevertheless, a weak causal relationship is determined from the Pearson analysis.

The trend appears to result in a statistically inverse effect, as shares of state funding allocations tend to be higher for institutions whose government relations offices maintain smaller personnel support. The exception to this rule involves the employment of professionals who help with state relations duties. Nevertheless, as this research is intended to help provide a foundation for future analysis in this field, it is expected that the data provided from these findings will help lay the foundation for further examination in this field of study.

Discussion

A majority of the study's findings suggest the personnel size and structure share very little, if any, causal effect on funding levels. Given as much, the statistical correlations leave more research to be desired. With higher percentages of state budgets and state higher education budgets allocated to institutions with fewer government relations personnel, an explanation of this trend is delegated to future investigation. Further exploration may lead to a discovery of trends or elements associated with government relations offices that may serve as predictors for state funding of higher education institutions. Such predictors would maintain not only a consistent statistical correlation with state funding variables, but also prove to be a likely causal effect for funding levels.

However, additional analyses not directly associated with the research questions suggest that further study should be completed to explain the negative correlation between personnel size and structure, and, portions of funding received. For instance, larger monetary allocations account for smaller shares of state budgets; conversely, they also account for larger shares of

state higher education budgets. Furthermore, it appears state funding and higher education funding share a strong correlation and relationship. As the portion of total state budgets allocated to institutions increases, the portion allocated from state higher education budgets also increases. Additionally, utilizing state population as a variable or predictor may or may not be applicable given that the analyses reflect a positive correlation between population size and funding portions.

In short, it cannot be assumed that smaller government relations offices account for greater shares of resources. Likewise it should not be perceived that larger offices account for less. Although statistical correlations indicate as much, further analysis should be conducted that includes variables such as: actual dollar amounts, intrastate public higher education competition, state funding laws and policies, etc.

For example, knowing that institutions in more populated states receive a smaller percentage of the overall state and higher education budgets (Tables 1 and 2), further study of funding regulations should be conducted in lieu of the correlation analysis indicating the existence of a positive direction between population size and funding portions. Performing additional in-depth analyses such as this would not only add to this collection of data, it could also help provide further explanation of the results from the research questions.

This study is intended to contribute to a foundation for future research concerning government relations operations in the higher education sector. The long-term purpose of the research is not solely to establish baseline data for future studies, but to foster curiosity stemming from its findings. From the questions that may evolve from this analysis, perhaps it can be decided whether a preferred method or formula exists for structuring a government relations office. With the cost to provide and purchase a college education continuing to escalate, it is

increasingly incumbent upon administrators to develop effective strategies that maximize an institution's potential to secure resources. Although this study was not designed to determine causal relationships, the results may help provide a starting point from which future examination of the topic may be surveyed, and from which government relations offices may be constructed in the future.

References

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006). *Public policy agenda 2006*. Washington, DC: Author.

Cook, C. E. (2004). The arrival of the 104th Congress. In C. E. Cook (Ed.), *Lobbying for Higher Education: How colleges and universities influence federal policy* (pp.53-63).

Ehrenberg, R. G., & Rizzo, R. G. (2004). Financial forces and the future of American higher education. *Academe, 90*(4), 28-31. Retrieved July 14, 2007 from ProQuest Research Library database (Document ID: 674044531)

Gianneschi, M. E. (2004). The effect of changes in state appropriations on voluntary giving to state supported universities. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Arizona, 2005). Retrieved July 8, 2007, from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database (Publication No. AAT 3132222)

Harvey, J., & Immerwahr, J. (1995). Public perceptions of higher education: On main street and in the boardroom. *Educational Record, 76*(4), 51-56.

Hebel, S., & Selingo, J. (2001, April 20). For public colleges, a decade of generous state budgets is over. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(32). Retrieved July 7, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No. 00095982)

Hebel, S. (2003, June 20). To ease budget crunch, public universities seek freedom from state controls. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(41). A19.

Henson, M., & Raiti, H. (2003). Trickle-down cuts. *AFT On Campus, 5*(1). Retrieved July 8, 2007 from http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/on_campus/2003/sep/feature.htm

Hicock, E. W. (2006, March 10). Higher education needs reform, too. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 52*(27), B48-B49.

Ikenberry, S. O. (March 2001). Higher education and market forces. *USA Today Magazine, 129*(2670). Retrieved June 9, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No. 01617389)

Johnstone, D. B. (2005). Financing higher education: Who should pay? In P.G. Altbach, R.O. Berdahl, and P.J. Gumpoty (Eds.), *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century* (pp.369-392). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Jones, D. (2003). State shortfalls projected throughout the decade. *Policy Alert*. San Jose, CA: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Retrieved July 7, 2007 from http://www.higheredinfo.org

Kane, T. J., & Orszag, P. R. (2003). Higher education spending: The role of Medicaid and the business cycle. *The Brookings Institution Policy Brief,* 124. Retrieved March 10, 2007 from thttp://www.brook.edu/comm/policybriefs/pb124.htm

MacTaggart, T. J. (2004). The ambiguous future of public higher education systems. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Competing Conceptions of Academic Governance.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Malveaux, J. (2004). Will tuition become a campaign issue? *Black Issues in Higher Education, 21*(11), 39.

Manzo, K. M. (2006, March 27). Report: Budget optimism doesn't translate into more state funding for higher education. *Community College Week, 10,* 12-15.

Melton, P. B. (2002). Shifting political dynamics: An uncertain political and economic climate poses new challenges to the future of higher education. *Black Issues in Higher Education, 19*(21), 30-31. Retrieved April 7, 2007 from EBSCOhost database (ISSN No. 07420277)

National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. (2004). *The educational pipeline: Big investment, big returns.* Retrieved July 10, 2007 from the World Wide Web: http://www.highereducation.org/reports/pipeline/

National Education Association Higher Education Research Center. (2003). Why are college prices increasing and what should we do about it? *Update, 9*(5), 3.

Potter, W. (2003, August 8). State lawmakers again cut higher-education spending bill. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *49*(48). A48.

Quillian, B. (2005, November). Regaining the trust in higher education. Paper presented at the meeting of the TIAA-CREF Institute Conference, New York, New York. In R. L. Clark & M. d'Ambrosio (Eds.) *The New Balancing Act in the Business of Higher Education Conference Volume: TIAA-CREF Institute Series on Higher Education.* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing (2006). Retrieved March 9, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http://www.tiaa-crefinstitute.org/research/articles/030106.html

Smith, M. F. (2004). Growing expenses, shrinking resources: The states and higher education. *Academe*, *90*(4), 32. Retrieved April 7, 2007 from ProQuest Research Library database (Document ID: 674044551)

Trombley, W. (2003). College affordability in higher education: The rising price of higher education. *National Crosstalk*, *11*(1), 1A.

University of Arkansas 2010 Commission. (2001). *Making the case: The impact of the University of Arkansas on the future of the state of Arkansas*. Fayetteville, AR: Author.

Ward, D. (2004). Can higher education use public opinion to shape debates? *Presidency*, *7*(2), 9-10.

Wellman, J. V. (2002). *Weathering the double whammy*. Retrieved July 7, 2007 from ERIC Document Reproduction Service (No. EJ650753)

Zemsky, R. (2003). Have we lost the 'public' in higher education? *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 49*(38). B7-B9.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. In P.G. Altbach, R.O. Berdahl, and P.J. Gumport (Eds.), *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Table 1.

Allocations to Institutions as Percentage of State General Fund (FY 2006-07)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	**State General Fund (estimate) (*millions*)	Allocation as % of General Fund
Arizona State University	354,043	10,728	3.30%
Auburn University	167,011	8,555	1.95
Clemson University	100,476	7,417	1.35
Colorado State University	123,364[1]	7,869	1.56
Florida State University	281,188	32,081	0.87
Georgia Institute of Technology	212,078	21,377	0.99
Indiana University	191,855	12,854	1.49
Iowa State University	183,798	5,600	3.28
Kansas State University	163,024	6,365	2.56
Louisiana State University and A&M College	183,965	8,569	2.14
Michigan State University	292,186	9,225	3.16
Mississippi State University	90,518	4,402	2.05
North Carolina State University	306,279	19,913	1.53
Ohio State University	332,757	26,629	1.24
Oklahoma State University	123,311	6,262	1.96
Pennsylvania State University	327,715	26,367	1.24
Purdue University	241,259	12,854	1.87
Texas A&M University	275,609	44,795	0.61
Texas Tech University	150,344	44,795	0.33
University of Alabama	171,299	8,555	2.00
University of Arizona	320,798	10,728	2.99
University of Arkansas	110,788	4,059	2.72
University of California-Berkeley	445,138	105,335	0.42
University of California-Los Angeles	562,475	105,335	0.53
University of Colorado	178,395	7,869	2.26
University of Connecticut	221,291	15,357	1.44
University of Delaware	113,098	3,960	2.85
University of Florida	362,747	32,081	1.13
University of Georgia	348,704	21,377	1.63
University of Illinois	341,025	29,083	1.17
University of Iowa	235,316[2]	5,600	4.20

(table continues)

Table 1. (continued)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	**State General Fund (estimate) (*millions*)	Allocation as % of General Fund
University of Kansas	145,004	6,365	2.27%
University of Kentucky	311,945	9,691	3.21
University of Maryland	370,869	14,387	2.57
University of Massachusetts	443,803	28,859	1.53
University of Michigan	325,796	9,225	3.53
University of Minnesota	619,579	18,062	3.43
University of Mississippi	70,406	4,402	1.59
University of Missouri	376,122[3]	8,515	4.41
University of Nebraska	207,705	3,629	5.72
University of North Carolina	488,678[4]	19,913	2.45
University of Oklahoma	136,334	6,262	2.17
University of Oregon	68,747[5]	7,105	0.96
University of Rhode Island	83,333	3,274	2.54
University of South Carolina	148,113	7,417	1.99
University of Tennessee	181,357	10,998	1.64
University of Texas	316,406	44,795	0.70
University of Vermont	40,847	1,173	3.48
University of Virginia	174,857	18,243	0.95
University of Washington	341,161	14,823	2.30
University of Wisconsin	395,015	13,187	2.99
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	174,857	18,243	0.95
Washington State University	194,063	14,823	1.30
West Virginia University	105,736	4,126	2.56

*Source (unless noted otherwise): Grapevine online database, Illinois State University.
**Source: NGA/NASBO, *The Fiscal Survey of States* (June2007).
[1]CSU allocations reported as system (includes Pueblo campus)
[2]University of Iowa allocations include Primary Health Care.
[3]Although University of Missouri allocations are reported as 'system' allocation, multiple campuses do not exist, and health-related allocations are reported separately.
[4]UNC-Chapel Hill allocations reported as separate units in Academic Affairs, Health Affairs, and Area Health Education Center. This does not include UNC Hospitals.
[5]Data provided from Oregon University System 2006-07 Budget Report Summary, published by the OUS Chancellor's Office (p.8). General fund revenue is distributed to all state schools based on full-time enrollment and public service/research programs (p.22)

Table 2.

Allocations as Percentage of State Higher Education Expenditures (FY 2006-07)

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	*State HIED Expenditures (*thousands*)	Allocation as % of State HIED Expenditures
Arizona State University	354,043	1,106,111	32.0%
Auburn University	167,011	1,670,508	9.99
Clemson University	100,476	859,360	11.6
Colorado State University	123,364[1]	680,407	18.1
Florida State University	281,188	3,525,639	7.97
Georgia Institute of Technology	212,078	2,208,459	9.60
Indiana University	191,855	1,457,164	13.1
Iowa State University	183,798	803,998	22.8
Kansas State University	163,024	788,720	20.6
Louisiana State University and A&M College	183,965	1,420,236	12.9
Michigan State University	292,186	2,074,370	14.0
Mississippi State University	90,518	904,205	10.0
North Carolina State University	306,279	3,373,636	9.07
Ohio State University	332,757	2,175,930	15.2
Oklahoma State University	123,311	956,464	12.8
Pennsylvania State University	327,715	2,153,998	15.2%
Purdue University	241,259	1,457,164	16.5
Texas A&M University	275,609	5,457,578	5.05
Texas Tech University	150,344	5,457,578	2.75
University of Alabama	171,299	1,670,508	10.2
University of Arizona	320,798	1,106,111	29.0
University of Arkansas	110,788	785,273	14.1
University of California-Berkeley	445,138	10,842,321	4.10
University of California-Los Angeles	562,475	10,842,321	5.18
University of Colorado	178,395	680,407	26.2
University of Connecticut	221,291	883,116	25.0
University of Delaware	113,098	233,226	48.4
University of Florida	362,747	3,525,639	10.2
University of Georgia	348,704	2,208,459	15.7
University of Illinois	341,025	2,791,287	12.2
University of Iowa	235,316[2]	803,998	29.2

(table continues)

Table 2 (continued).

Institution	*State Allocation (*thousands*)	*State HIED Expenditures (*thousands*)	Allocation as % of State HIED Expenditures
University of Kansas	145,004	788,720	18.3%
University of Kentucky	311,945	1,253,076	24.8
University of Maryland	370,869	1,436,393	25.8
University of Massachusetts	443,803	996,025	44.5
University of Michigan	325,79	2,074,370	15.7
University of Minnesota	619,579	1,400,500	44.2
University of Mississippi	70,406	904,205	7.78
University of Missouri	376,122[3]	878,337	42.8
University of Nebraska	207,705	571,047	36.3
University of North Carolina	488,678[4]	3,373,636	14.4
University of Oklahoma	136,334	956,464	14.2
University of Oregon	68,747[5]	650,066	10.5
University of Rhode Island	83,333	184,466	45.1%
University of South Carolina	148,113	859,360	17.2
University of Tennessee	181,357	1,241,782	14.6
University of Texas	316,406	5,457,578	5.79
University of Vermont	40,847	85,217	47.9
University of Virginia	174,857	1,856,731	9.41
University of Washington	341,161	1,631,059	20.9
University of Wisconsin	395,015[6]	1,177,160	33.5
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	174,857	1,856,731	9.41
Washington State University	194,063	1,631,059	11.8
West Virginia University	105,736	387,211	27.3

*Source (unless noted otherwise): Grapevine online database, Illinois State University.
[1]CSU allocations reported as system (includes Pueblo campus).
[2]University of Iowa allocations include Primary Health Care.
[3]Although University of Missouri allocations are reported as 'system' allocation, multiple campuses do not exist, and health-related allocations are reported separately.
[4]UNC-Chapel Hill allocations reported as separate units in Academic Affairs, Health Affairs, and Area Health Education Center. This does not include UNC Hospitals.
[5]Data provided from Oregon University System 2006-07 Budget Report Summary, published by the OUS Chancellor's Office (p.8). General fund revenue is distributed to all state schools based on full-time enrollment and public service/research programs (p.22).

[6] The University of Wisconsin-Madison does not directly receive state appropriations funding. Legislative funding is allocated to a university system, upon which a governing authority appropriates funding to individual UW campuses. At the time research was conducted, Grapevine did not offer specific data for the Madison campus. However, the U.S. Department of Education Integrated Postsecondary Education System offered state appropriations information for UW-Madison through the 2005-06 budget year. Given the biennial nature of Wisconsin's budget, it is presumed the 2005-06 budget would not significantly deviate from the 2006-07 budget, thus the 2005-06 data is used for this study.