## Center for Higher Education Illinois State University 331 DeGarmo Hall, Normal, IL 61761-6901 (309) 438-5405

Since 1958 Grapevine

34th Year

Number 376

February 1992

Page 3085

## TIMELY DATA CIRCULATED WHILE CURRENT

Reports on state tax legislation; state appropriations for universities, colleges and community colleges; legislation affecting education beyond the high school.

## IN THIS ISSUE

GRAPEVINE
3092j.
Replies are requested by April 1, 1992, and should be sent to <u>Grapevine</u> (address on page 3092).
READERS ARE ASKED TO RESPOND TO A SHORT SURVEY
The article discusses the similarities and differences among states when they are compared on the three measuresappropriations per student, per capita, and per \$1,000 of personal income.
Revised from earlier reports, this table uses the most currently available data to compute these measures.
Table 2. Appropriations Per Capital and Per \$1,000 of Personal Income, FY1990 3089
The rationale and procedures used to calculate two versions of this measure are discussed in the article.
Table 1. Rankings of the States on Appropriations Per Student, FY1990 3086
DEVELOPING A PER STUDENT MEASURE CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Edward R. Hines, Editor

M. M. Chambers, Founding Editor

Gwen B. Pruyne, Managing Editor

Responsibility for errors in the data or for opinions expressed is not to be attributed to any organization or person other than the Editors. <u>Grapevine</u> is circulated to key persons in the fifty states. Not copyrighted.

Table 1. RANKINGS OF THE STATES ON APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION, PER STUDENT (TWO VERSIONS), FY1989-90

	Appropriation	,		Approps/	
States (1)	(In \$1,000s)	Total Enroll		Public Enroll	
$\frac{(1)}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2}$	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Alabama	776,641	3,162	18	3,457	31
Alaska	178,188	6,224	1	6,782	1
Arizona	553,547	2,191	45	2,313	49
Arkansas	320,613	3,620	10	4,196	15
California	5,487,892	3,142	19	3,573	26
Colorado	505,994	2,496	41	2,851	45
Connecticut	511,567	3,004	24	4,626	8
Delaware	115,541	2,849	30	3 <b>,</b> 497	27
Florida	1,557,091	2,714	32	3,238	37
Georgia	884,669	3,698	8	4,737	7
Hawaii	279,241	5,153	2	6,398	2
Idaho	158 <b>,</b> 247	3,232	14	4,116	16
Illinois	1,712,850	2,413	43	3,192	40
Indiana	814,021	2,951	27	3,761	21
Iowa	528 <b>,</b> 499	3,111	22	4,521	9
Kansas	435,609	2,695	33	2,938	43
Kentucky	550,328	3,315	12	4,008	19
Louisiana	527,037	2,929	28	3,473	29
Maine	173,534	2,980	26	4,284	12
Maryland	822,337	3,166	16	3,704	23
Massachusetts	815,998	1,913	47	4,346	11
Michigan	1,408,006	2,513	40	2,935	44
Minnesota	946,779	3,741	6	4,767	6
Mississippi	432,971	3,721	7	4,202	14
Missouri	582,557	2,092	46	3,029	41
Montana	109,416	2,905	29	3,296	36
Nebraska	293,242	2,694	34	3,211	39
Nevada	146,636	2,597	36	2,610	48
New Hampshire	69,035	1,178	50	2,099	50
New Jersey	1,124,367	3,580	11	4,435	10
New Mexico	296,410	3,644	9	3,735	22
New York	3,185,045	3,113	21	•	
North Carolina			3	5,258 5,264	4
North Dakota	129,756	4,223		5,264	3
Ohio	1,427,041	3,216	15	3,460	30
Oklahoma		2,588	37	3,457	32
	453,090	2,576	38	2,992	42
Oregon	395,898	2,447	42	2,802	46
Pennsylvania	1,370,011	2,245	44	4,088	17
Rhode Island	139,174	1,819	48	3,428	34
South Carolina		4,203	4	5,163	<u> </u>
South Dakota	86,064	2,635	35	3,432	33
Tennessee	709,116	3,240	13	4,245	13
Texas	2,624,288	2,989	25	3,354	35
Utah	292 <b>,</b> 720	2,549	39	3,676	24
Vermont	57 <b>,</b> 596	1,602	49	2,752	47
Virginia	1,089,276	3,164	17	3,787	20
Washington	796,400	3,114	20	3,598	25
West Virginia	252,180	3,058	23	3,479	28
Wisconsin	795,383	2,736	31	3,234	38
Wyoming	116,183	3,984	5	4,069	18
Total	39,109,108	2,923		3,724	
Sources: Appropriation		dua daka			

Sources: Appropriations, revised from Grapevine data.

Enrollment: U. S. Department of Education, Enrollment in Higher Education, Fall 1989.

# DEVELOPING A PER STUDENT MEASURE--CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES by Edward Hines and Sara Wills\*

Considerable interest has been shown in a measure of state higher education appropriations per student. This interest has been expressed to GRAPEVINE for several years, but we have not moved ahead with developing a per student measure because of methodological problems. Rather, GRAPEVINE has continued to utilize two widely-accepted comparative measures of state higher education support -- state tax appropriations per capita and appropriations per \$1,000 of personal income. These two measures are used commonly in higher education finance, and they are recognized as appropriate indices of state support.

The December-January 1992 issue of GRAPEVINE (Number 379) included FY1992 appropriations per capita and per \$1,000 of personal income measures were calculated. In this issue, two different versions of the per student measure were calculated. We solicit the reactions of GRAPEVINE readers as to which of the two measures portrays a more valid indicator of state support. Readers are invited to use the form provided on the last two pages in this issue of GRAPEVINE for this purpose.

Conceptual Issues. There is substantial support for utilizing a per student measure when comparing states' effort in supporting higher education. The interest in using this measure has increased because of the realization that enrollment growth is not consistent across the states. In fact, some states, such as California, still are experiencing strong enrollment growth. Most states, however, have seen enrollment increases dwindle to the point of very small annual enrollment gains, or even declines, or declines in some sectors of higher education and stabilization or modest gains in other sectors. At a time when enrollment growth is inconsistent and uneven, it is especially advisable to include a per student measure in a complete analysis of the fiscal situation for higher education in a state.

When examining patterns of state higher education support, it is necessary to adjust for variations in population size, wealth, and other such differences across states. Using a per capita measure adjusts for differences in state resident population, and using a per \$1,000 of personal income measure adjusts for fundamental differences in states' wealth, as measured by personal income. These two measures, per capita and per \$1,000 of personal income, have been sufficient for comparison purposes. However, they can be enhanced with a per student measure, which is included in this issue of GRAPEVINE for the first time.

Methodological Issues. There are methodological problems in constructing a per student measure. There needs to be a consistent definition of a full-time student in different states. Enrollment data are not published and available until a substantial period of time after students actually attend. Still another issue is whether or not to utilize total enrollment data by state or to use only public sector enrollment. While GRAPEVINE data represent the total amount of state tax revenue appropriated to colleges and universities, both public and private, state tax funds are the principal revenue source in the public sector, but are only one of several revenue sources in the private sector.

<sup>\*</sup>Sara Wills is a graduate assistant in the Center for Higher Education at Illinois State University.

<u>Procedure</u>. Enrollment data were obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics (July, 1991). Two major decisions had to be made in constructing the per student measure. One decision was to use the most recent enrollment data available even though those data were two years old. The second decision was to use GRAPEVINE data for that same year. It made no sense to use current appropriations data and two-year old enrollment data.

Next, a decision had to be made whether or not to use total state enrollment or enrollment in the public sector only. The RANKINGS table displays the per student measure both ways, column (3) uses total state enrollment, including private colleges and universities, and column (5) uses enrollment only in public colleges and universities.

In order to decide which of the per student measures was more accurate, a chart was constructed showing, in rank order, the 10 states having the largest private college and university enrollment. In six of the 10 states, rank order improved by utilizing public sector enrollment, rather than total state higher education enrollment. The explanation for this occurrence is that by eliminating private sector enrollment, the dollars per student increased markedly in states with large private sectors. This artificially skewed the ranking of these states. This phenomenon appeared to be especially evident in New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, the three states having the largest private sector enrollment. In fact, the private sector enrollment in these three states is larger than the private sector enrollment in the seven remaining states.

TABLE A

D = -1					
Rank on			Change in Rank		
Size of		Enrollment	Using Public		
Pvt Sector State		Pvt Sector	Enrollment		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
1	New York	417,593	21 to 4		
2	Pennsylvania	275,256	44 to 17		
3	Massachusetts	238,704	47 to 11		
4	California	210,670	19 to 26		
5	Illinois	173,294	43 to 40		
6	Ohio	138,656	37 to 32		
7	Texas	95,364	25 to 35		
8	Florida	92,843	32 to 37		
9	Missouri	86,183	46 to 41		
10	Michigan	80,606	40 to 44		
_					

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, "Fall Enrollment" Survey, 1989, Table 12, page 13 (July 1991).

It would appear that the column using total state enrollment provides a more valid and useful measure of state tax appropriations per student.

Analysis. The validity of the per student measure can be judged, also, by comparing state rankings on the per student measure with those of per capita and per \$1,000 of personal income measures. The per capita and per \$1,000 of personal income table uses FY1990 population and income data, and revised appropriations data. (See the next page) Thus, rankings can be compared using all three measures -- per student (appropriations divided by total enrollment, using the rankings in column 4 in Table 2), per capita, and per \$1,000 of personal income.

Table 2. RANKINGS OF THE STATES ON APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION, PER CAPITA AND PER \$1,000 PERSONAL INCOME, FISCAL YEAR 1989-90

Higher Educatio Appropriations States (\$1,000s) (1)		priations Capita Rank	Appropria Per \$1,000 (\$)	income
<u>States (\$1,000s)</u>	(\$) (3)	Rank		
	(3)			Rank
			(5)	(6)
	192.24	<u>(4)</u> 8	12.78	7
Alabama 776,641		1	14.90	2
Alaska 178,188	323.98	27	9.39	19
Arizona 553,547	151.04		9.60	18
Arkansas 320,613	137.54	39		
California 5,487,892	184.40	11	8.86	26
Colorado 505,994	153.61	25	8.11	33
Connecticut 511,567	155.63	23	6.10	47
Delaware 115,541	173.48	16	8.62	29
Florida 1,557,091	120.35	46	6.44	43
<u>Georgia</u> 884,669	136.57	41	7.98	36
Hawaii 279,241	252.02	3	12.32	8
Idaho 158,247	157.15	22	10.26	14
Illinois 1,712,850	149.84	28	7.33	41
Indiana 814,021	146.83	30	8.68	27
Iowa 528,499	190.31	9	11.04	12
Kansas 435,609	175.79	14	9.67	17
Kentucky 550,328	149.34	29	9.94	16
Louisiana 527,037	124.89	43	8.61	30
Maine 173,534	141.31	34	8.21	32
Maryland 822,337	172.00	17	7.86	37
Massachussetts 815,998	135.64	42	6.19	45
Michigan 1,408,006	151.48	26	8.23	31
Minnesota 946,779	216.41	5	11.51	11
Mississippi 432,971	168.27	19	13.12	6
Missouri 582,557	113.85	48	6.50	42
Montana 109,416	136.94	40	8.96	24
Nebraska 293,242	185.83	10	10.57	13
Nevada 146,636	121.99	45	6.29	44
New Hampshire 69,035	62.25	50	2.98	50
New Jersey 1,124,367	145.45	31	5.83	48
New Mexico 296,410	195.65	7	13.67	3
New York 3,185,045	177.05	12	8.01	35
North Carolina 1,458,516	220.02	4	13.46	4
North Dakota 129,756	203.06	6	13.40	5
Ohio 1,427,041	137.92	38	7.48	39
Oklahoma 453,090	144.02	33	9.32	20
	139.30	36	8.05	34
Oregon 395,898 Pennsylvania 1,370,011	115.30	47	6.16	46
Rhode Island 139,174	138.76	37	7.37	40
	175.71	15	11.56	10
	123.66	44	7.83	38
South Dakota 86,064	145.40	32	9.15	23
Tennessee 709,116			9.21	22
Texas 2,624,288	154.49	24	12.10	9
Utah 292,720	169.89	18	5.82	49
Vermont 57,596	102.30	49		
Virginia 1,089,276	176.06	13	8.91	25
Washington 796,400	163.67	20	8.64	28
West Virginia 252,180	140.65	35	10.24	15
Wisconsin 795,383	162.62	21	9.23	21
Wyoming 116,183	255.91	2	15.75	1
Total 39,109,108	160.59	24.03.wz-m	8.53	

Sources: Revised appropriations data from Grapevine.

<sup>1990</sup> Population, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

Personal Income, U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis

The top 10 and bottom 10 states on each of the three measures are shown in Table B below. There appears to be considerable similarity in the states which appear in either the top or the bottom grouping. In the top grouping, Alaska, Hawaii, North Carolina, Wyoming, and New Mexico appeared in all three rankings. Minnesota was high on all three measures, just missing the top 10 on appropriations per \$1,000 of personal income by one point (ranked 11th). In the bottom grouping, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire appeared three times.

Table B

	Approp	Approp	Approp
Rank	Per Student	Per Capita	Per \$1,000
_(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Alaska	Alaska	Wyoming
2	Hawaii	Wyoming	Alaska
3	North Carolina	Hawaii	New Mexico
4	South Carolina	North Carolina	North Carolina
5	Wyoming	Minnesota	North Dakota
6	Minnesota	North Dakota	Mississippi
7	Mississippi	New Mexico	Alabama
8	Georgia	Alabama	Hawaii
9	New Mexico	Iowa	Utah
10	Arkansas	Nebraska	South Carolina
41	Colorado	Georgia	Illinois
42	Oregon	Massachusetts	Missouri
43	Illinois	Louisiana	Florida
44	Pennsylvania	South Dakota	Nevada
45	Arizona	Nevada	Massachusetts
46	Missouri	Florida	Pennsylvania
47	Massachusetts	Pennsylvania	Connecticut
48	Rhode Island	Missouri	New Jersey
49	Vermont	Vermont	Vermont
50	New Hampshire	New Hampshire	New Hampshire

There were other states, some of which appeared in either the top or bottom grouping once or twice, which had similar rankings on two measures, but a much different ranking on the third measure. For instance, South Carolina and Mississippi, were in the "top 10 grouping" in both per student and per \$1,000 of personal income, but were lower in per capita support. Alabama, Nebraska and North Dakota were high on both per capita and per \$1,000 of personal income, but were mid-range to low on per student support. Maryland was mid-range on per student and per capita, but low on per \$1,000 of personal income.

The states exhibiting an extremely varied pattern included Georgia which ranked 8th on per student, 41st on per capita and 36th on \$1,000 of personal income. Arkansas was 10th on per student, 39th on per capita, and 18th on \$1,000 of personal income. Utah was 39th on per student, 18th on per capita, and 9th on \$1,000 of personal income. New York was 21st in per student, 12th in per capita, and 35th in per \$1,000 of personal income.

Reactions to these patterns and to the use of these measures are invited from GRAPEVINE readers and others interested in state higher education finance.

### PLEASE REPLY BEFORE APRIL 1, 1992.

### GRAPEVINE NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

We want your reaction to the per student measure as well as your views about <u>Grapevine</u>. Please answer the questions below. Remove this page and return the completed questionnaire to the address at the end of the survey.

- What is your reaction to the "per student" measure which is presented in this issue?
  - a. Do you agree that using tax appropriations divided by total student enrollment is more accurate than appropriations divided by public sector enrollment for your state?
  - b. Is your state more accurately represented on the per student measure by using only public student enrollment data?
- 2. Would you like <u>Grapevine</u> to include information on sources of revenue other than state tax funds?

Yes	No
(If Yes, indicate your	preference below. Check all that apply)
Source of Funds	Name and address of person who can supply this information in your state:
Federal Sources	
Student Tuition and Fees	
Local Taxes	
Non-tax Sources	
Other, Please Specify	

(Continues on the reverse side)

3.	What	information	ı in <u>Gr</u>	apevine	is ı	most	usefu	l to	you?			
4.	What	information	ı in <u>Gr</u>	apevine	is .	least	usef	ul to	you?			
		TH	ANK YOU	J FOR YO	OUR T	IME 1	AND AS	SSIST	ANCE.			
below	v if yo	ity will not ou wish to r <u>ine</u> address	emain	anonymo	us.	Retu	. You rn yo	may ur co	remov mplet	e the ed qu	mailing la estionnaire	be t
												_
Cente 331 D Illinois	eGarmo	gher Educatio Hall University	n	,							Non-Profit Org U.S. POSTAG PAID Normal, Illinois Permit No. 1	E
Addre	ss corre	ction requested									**************************************	

meren