

MULTIPLE-CAMPUS COLLEGES^{1*}

Edward R. Hines

The growth of higher education in the United States has produced one development relatively unknown in other countries—the multi-campus college. It has been a disjointed sort of growth, with different patterns in different communities (Sammartino, 1964, p. 503).

..In every state the system of higher education has been under growing pressure to "set its own house in order." Every year special state educational commissions are established to look into the way in which schools of higher learning are equipped to meet the challenge of present and future enrollment trends. And high on the agenda of these groups is the objective of developing some rational scheme for avoiding needless duplication of facilities (Moos & Rourke, The Campus and the State, 1959, pp. 52-53).

The two references above capture much of the early concerns about the growth of higher education and the continuing need for accountability. Those concerns and needs continue to the present. Every year, GRAPEVINE includes a "feature" dealing with multi-campus universities and consolidated systems of higher education. That subject is the focus of this issue. An added element is the inclusion of a historical perspective of multi-campus universities and consolidated systems.

Historical Perspective. The early writings on "multiple-campus colleges," to use Sammartino's label, made no distinction between what are now termed, multi-campus universities and consolidated systems of higher education. No mention of multi-campus or consolidated systems was contained in Glenn's classic analysis of coordination versus governance (1959). Even in the seminal work by Moos & Rourke (1959), the concern was focused on "the outright consolidation of several institutions into one university," as a *means of co-ordination* (p. 209, emphasis added). The early literature treated multi-campus systems as one organizational form in higher education, while consolidated systems were viewed as an approach to governance, as illustrated by the single, consolidated statewide governing board such as found in North Carolina and Wisconsin.

By the early 1970s, coordination and governance of higher education were major concerns throughout the country. Coordination and governance, including the issue of whether or not there should be "superboards" with authority for education at all levels, became a topic of great interest with the publication of Berdahl's Statewide Coordination of Higher Education (1971). In Berdahl's book, there was little mention of multi-campus universities and consolidated systems of higher education. The two publications of Lee and Bowen in the 1970s zeroed in on the multi-campus university "as a possible answer to the organization of higher education" (Lee & Bowen, 1971, p. 8). Noting that the "coexistence of a number of *geographically* distinct communities is the defining characteristic of a multi-campus university," Lee & Bowen studied

*See page 3152 for footnotes.

MULTI-CAMPUS UNIVERSITIES WHICH RECEIVED \$100,000,000 OR MORE OF STATE TAX FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR OPERATING EXPENSES FOR FY1992-93, WITH PERCENTAGES OF GAIN OVER THE MOST RECENT TWO AND TEN YEARS (In thousands of dollars)

Institutions	Year 1982-83	Year 1990-91	Year 1992-93	2-yr gain Percent	10-yr gain Percent
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
U of California	1,097,293	2,076,662	1,881,117	- 9	71
U of Texas	796,587	938,367	988,141	5	24
U of Illinois	347,564	601,402	576,074	- 4	66
U of Minnesota	260,492	469,497	438,216	- 7	68
Texas A&M U	274,966	359,401	389,120	8	42
U of Wisconsin*	234,805	354,180	376,137	6	60
U of Hawaii	185,526	313,531	341,693	9	84
Indiana U	174,950	334,667	339,996	2	94
Louisiana State U	278,584	339,248	324,004	- 4	16
U of Michigan	175,271	299,800	308,712	3	76
U of Nebraska	147,008	273,357	296,656	9	102
U of Tennessee	165,930	286,895	293,404	2	77
Ohio State U**	205,109	331,251	302,365	- 9	47
U of Missouri***	183,758	300,496	289,351	- 4	57
U of Alabama***	129,094	277,293	281,047	1	118
U of Kentucky	147,695	267,898	280,465	5	90
Pennsylvania State U+	143,481	239,489	249,204	4	74
Rutgers, St U of NJ+	135,313+++	236,006	243,381	3	80
Purdue U	124,942	237,494	240,682	1	93
U of Arkansas	124,855	200,960	232,499	16	86
U of Massachusetts+	175,651	284,328	221,617	- 22	26
Arizona State U	89,226	206,523	207,079	0	132
U of Iowa	128,698	195,370	198,550	2	54
U of South Carolina	98,670	177,783	176,578	- 1	79
Southern Illinois U	121,826	186,482	176,501	- 5	45
U of Connecticut+	113,182	192,459	175,004	- 9	55
U of Colorado	127,905	169,031	169,137	0	32
U of Alaska	148,532	170,382	166,041	- 3	12
U of Kansas++	131,522	166,921	162,944	- 2	24
Auburn U***	71,311	153,454	155,280	1	118
Oklahoma State U	109,476	138,193	154,003	11	41
U of Oklahoma	110,587	137,483	153,446	12	39
U of New Mexico	83,643	137,985	147,725	7	77
U of Houston	108,927	134,984	145,401	8	33
West Virginia U***	90,992	141,701	145,223	2	60
U of Pittsburgh+	78,235	130,885	135,073	3	73
U of Cincinnati	83,300	142,347	132,180	- 7	59
U of Virginia	94,051	159,521	129,823	- 19	38
U of Mississippi++	70,832	104,293	107,067	3	51
Totals	7,369,789	11,868,019	11,730,936		
Weighted average percentages of gain				- 1	59

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

**An estimated sum has been added to each figure for the branch campuses at Mansfield, Lima, Marion and Newark.

***The ten-year gain may be somewhat overstated because the FY1982-83 figure for this institution does not include some items which were reported as a lump sum at that time.

+The figures for all three fiscal years do not include some amounts reported as a lump sum, including one or more of the following: salary increases, fringe benefits, collective bargaining or interdepartmental transfers.

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

+++Does not reflect subsequent revisions.

nine such multi-campus entities. Five of their nine institutions were within the definition of a multi-campus university used by GRAPEVINE, including the Universities of California, Illinois, Missouri, Texas, and Wisconsin. Lee & Bowen's "flagship systems," "had their origins in a single main campus from which the larger university developed" (p. 73) with growth taking one of three forms: 1) a main campus with separate "branches" of two-year, four-year, or professional varieties; 2) the system, itself, created new campuses; and 3) either the system or the major campus took on already existing campuses. A distinction of multi-campus universities important to GRAPEVINE is the importance of the primary or "mother" campus as a central focus to the multi-campus system.

The other four entities studied by Lee & Bowen are among the consolidated systems of higher education, as defined by GRAPEVINE. They included the California State University system, the City University of New York, the State University of New York, and the University of North Carolina. These systems are what Lee & Bowen termed "comprehensive multi-campus universities." Further distinctions of consolidated systems of higher education used by GRAPEVINE include the existence of separate campuses prior to the formation of the system. These distinct campuses were administered separately and located some distances from one another. The system board, perhaps a governing board, may be located in the state capital, and it may have been formed after some of the member campuses were founded.

More recently, a typology of multi-campus systems was described which differentiated private from public multi-campus systems and heterogeneous from homogeneous systems (Creswell, Roskens, & Henry, 1985). The system used in GRAPEVINE is somewhat similar in consolidated systems resembling heterogeneous and multi-campus systems being similar to homogeneous systems. However, the similarities are only approximated. Pettit, in a letter contained in Newman (1987), conceptualized consolidated governing boards, having either "weak" or "strong" executives, as contrasted with "less-than-statewide multi-campus systems.

What is noteworthy in the multi-campus and consolidated distinctions, as used in GRAPEVINE, is the incorporation of a historical consideration of how the entity was formed, when the current governance systems came into being, and the relationships among constituent campuses, the governing board, and the "home" campus.

The Current Situation in FY1993. This year, there were 39 multi-campus universities and 29 consolidated systems of higher education, which received more than \$100 million in state tax appropriations, as shown in the two tables. These 68 entities are a major feature in American higher education. They garnered a total of \$25.1 billion (63.7%) of the national total of \$39.4 billion appropriated by state governments to higher education. This figure of about 63% has held constant for several years, in spite of the varying amounts appropriated each year, as well as the "ups and downs" of the amounts appropriated by individual states in specific years.

Budgetary and Enrollment Comparisons². We wondered how the enrollment share of multi-campus universities and consolidated systems would compare with the budgetary share of the same entities. Therefore, using 1993 appropriations data and the most recent enrollment data available (Fall 1991), the relevant percentages were calculated. In appropriations amounts, \$11.7 billion or 29.8% of the national total of \$39.4 billion was appropriated to multi-campus universities. The consolidated systems (less the constituent multi-campus universities) were appropriated \$11.9 or 30.2% of the total of \$39.4 billion. These two percentages together represent 59.4% of the national total, and the difference between this 59.4% and the 63.7% shown above, is accounted for by the seven multi-campus universities which also are part of consolidated systems.³

Looking at enrollment, a different view emerges. Multi-campus universities had 2.0 million of the 11.3 million students enrolled in public institutions (17.8%), while in consolidated systems there were 2.9 million or 25.1%, after subtracting the constituent multi-campus

FOOTNOTES

¹Peter Sammartino, "Multiple-Campus Colleges," *Journal of Higher Education* 35:9 (December, 1964), pp. 503-505.

²Gwen Pruyne and Sara Wills did the enrollment calculations in this section, based on NCES enrollment data for Fall 1991.

³There are seven multi-campus universities, with appropriations in excess of \$100 million per annum, which are part of the consolidated systems identified in this analysis. They include Arizona State University, the Universities of Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, and Mississippi, West Virginia University, and the University of Wisconsin Doctoral Cluster. The enrollment represented in these seven universities was deleted from the consolidated system enrollment, in order not to "double count" these students.

REFERENCES

Baker, M. 1974. "Multi-Campus and Consolidated University Systems: Administrative Structures and Governance." Rolla: University of Missouri, ED 138 174.

Berdahl, R.O. 1971. Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Creswell, J.W., Roskens, R.W., & Henry, T.C. 1985. "A Typology of Multi-campus Systems," Journal of Higher Education 56:1

Epstein, L.D. 1974. Governing the University: The Campus and the Public Interest. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Glenny, L.A. 1959. Autonomy of Public Colleges. The Carnegie Series in American Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

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

----- 1975. Managing Multi-campus Systems: Effective Administration In an Unsteady State. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Moos, M & Rourke, F.E. 1959. The Campus and the State. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.

Newman, F. 1987. Choosing Quality: Reducing Conflict Between the State and the University. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Sammartino, P. 1964. "Multiple-Campus Colleges," Journal of Higher Education 35:9.

Womack, F.W. & Podemski, R.S. 1985. "Criteria for Effective Planning in Multi-Campus Systems." Planning for Higher Education.

Grapevine
Center for Higher Education
Illinois State University
5900 EAF
Normal, IL 61761

Address correction requested

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

APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF 29
 CONSOLIDATED SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY1982-83, FY1990-91 AND
 FY1992-93, WITH PERCENTAGES OF GAIN OVER THE MOST RECENT TWO AND TEN YEARS.

(In thousands of dollars)

System (1)	Year	Year	Year	2-year	10-year
	1982-83 (2)	1990-91 (3)	1992-93 (4)	Gain (5)	Gain (6)
CA California State U	907,335	1,691,403	1,516,908	- 10	67
NY State U of NY	1,014,005	1,188,024	1,149,259	- 3	13
NC U of North Carolina	586,655	1,094,151	1,145,895	5	95
FL State U System of Florida	588,632	1,014,205	958,977	- 5	63
GA U System of Georgia	534,219	961,283	951,726	- 1	78
WI U of Wisconsin System	462,627	690,911	735,201	6	59
MA Bd of Regents of High Ed	472,975	697,248	638,380	- 8	35
MD U of Maryland	238,155	592,891	546,386	- 8	129
NY City U of New York	348,417	641,342	532,093	- 17	53
AZ Arizona Board of Regents*	246,623	522,155	529,322	1	115
IA Iowa Board of Regents	284,444	442,095	457,216	3	61
KS Kansas Board of Regents	282,746	401,270	411,908	3	46
TN Bd of Regents System	213,236	377,828	403,761	7	89
OR System of High Ed	184,626	334,169	369,919	11	100
PA State System of Higher Ed	230,444	349,491	359,352	3	56
UT State Board of Regents	192,187	305,233	345,888	13	80
MS Insts of Higher Learning	221,816	305,418	306,524	0	38
LA Bd of Trustees System	173,148	193,050	236,467	22	37
NV U of Nevada System	71,929	163,324	207,572	27	189
WV Bd of Regents System**	121,640	194,799	204,434	5	68
ID Idaho Board of Education	93,826	183,999	192,609	5	105
MN St U System of Minnesota	95,020	175,677	175,652	0	85
IL Illinois Brd of Regents	116,878	179,162	169,242	- 6	45
IL Illinois Bd of Governors	105,518	167,453	154,719	- 8	47
ND State Bd of Higher Ed	104,638	129,757	145,536	12	39
ME U of Maine System	57,920	146,035	134,956	- 8	133
MT Montana U System	95,273	116,648	125,863	8	32
RI Bd of Governors for H Ed	91,674	127,969	118,911	- 7	30
CO State Board of Agriculture	65,777	102,842	107,221	4	63
Totals	8,202,383	13,489,832	13,331,897	- 1	63
Weighted averages percentages of gain				- 1	63

*Figure for FY1982-83 was estimated because the statewide total was revised, but the institutional figures were not available.

**In FY1982-83 and FY1990-91 some of the salary increases were reported as a lump sum. In FY1992-93 these items were included in the institutional data.

* * * * *

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

Fiscal Years	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
Consolidated	11	16	20	16	14	12	13	7	- 3	- 1
Multi-Campus	12	17	20	12	9	12	15	12	4	- 1
Nationwide	12	16	19	13	12	14	14	12	3	- 1

universities from their consolidated systems. Taken together, these entities enrolled 43.7% of the nation's enrollment total, a figure substantially less than the budgetary figure reported above. What might explain the difference between budgetary and enrollment shares? First, budgetary calculations for FY1993 and Fall 1991 enrollment data will not match perfectly, especially during a period of budgetary and enrollment instability and variation across states. Also, we are using only state tax appropriations data and not including revenue from other sources, including student tuition. At a time, for instance, when institutions are relying increasingly on student tuition as a revenue source and state tax appropriations are becoming a comparatively smaller share of the total, an analysis which uses only state tax appropriations has limitations. Second, these entities represent public sector campuses which are larger in size, offer graduate and professional programs in many instances, and have component parts which are units of sizeable magnitude, such as medical, dental, health science, and veterinary schools including teaching hospitals.

Multi-campus Universities. One entity, the University of California, received more than one billion dollars in FY1993 with the University of Texas nearing one billion in appropriations. In FY1993, there were 14 multi-campus universities which experienced negative changes or declines over two-years. The University of Massachusetts lost 22% over two years, the University of Virginia lost 19%, and the other 12 campuses with negative changes lost nine percent or less. Only three multi-campus universities gained more than 10% over two years--the University of Arkansas (16%), the University of Oklahoma (12%), and Oklahoma State (11%). The remainder of the multi-campus universities gained from zero to nine percent over two years. Overall, there was a one percent negative change over two years.

Consolidated Systems. Three consolidated systems received more than one billion dollars each--California State University, the State University of New York, and the University of North Carolina with the State University System of Florida and the University System of Georgia beginning to approach one billion dollars each. Two consolidated systems lost more than 10% in two years, the City University of New York (-17%) and California State University (-10%), and another 10 consolidated systems lost nine percent or less over two years. On the other hand, two consolidated systems gained over 20% over two years, the University of Nevada System (27%) and the Board of Trustees System in Louisiana (22%), and three systems gained over 10% over two years, the State Board of Regents in Utah, the State Board of Higher Education in North Dakota, and the System of Higher Education in Oregon. Overall, as with multi-campus universities, the consolidated systems lost one percent over two years.

Trends over Time. A 10-year trend is now possible, because the multi-campus-consolidated system comparison was made initially by GRAPEVINE in FY1984, so we now have a full decade of comparison data to examine. As the table shows, the trend in two-year percentage gains is ever downward with single-digit percentage gains or losses in the most recent two years. There were no negative changes until 1992 when consolidated systems had a 3% decline followed by one percent declines in both consolidated systems and multi-campus universities in 1993. Consolidated systems outpaced multi-campus universities only in 1987 and 1988, and the two types of entities tied in 1986, 1989, and 1993. In five of the 10 years, multi-campus universities outgained consolidated systems. Compared to the national trends, multi-campus universities performed better four times, tied three times, and fell behind three times. Consolidated systems, compared to the nation, were ahead only twice, tied three times, and lagged behind five times. The differences between these entities are small in magnitude, despite the large number of dollars represented, and the differences are not getting larger, except for the FY1992. It is of interest that 1992 was the year of greatest difference when the nation gained three percent over two years, multi-campus universities gained four percent, but consolidated systems lost three percent.