

# **State Funding for Community Colleges: Perceptions from the Field**

*A SURVEY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE  
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE DIRECTORS  
OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES*

**Stephen G. Katsinas KATSINAS@UNT.EDU**  
**Don A. Buchholz Chair of Higher Education and Director**  
**Bill J. Priest Center for Community College Education**  
**University of North Texas**  
**Denton, TX**

**James C. Palmer, Professor JCPALMER@ILSTU.EDU**  
**Center for the Study of Education Policy**  
**Illinois State University**  
**Normal, IL**

**Terrence A. Tollefson, Professor and Interim Chair, TOLLEFST@ETSU.EDU**  
**Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis**  
**East Tennessee State University**  
**Johnson City, TN**

**October 26, 2004**

## INTRODUCTION TO THE SURVEY AND METHODOLOGY

In recent years, shortfalls in state revenues have prompted heightened concern about the immediate short- and long-term future and stability of state investments in higher education. Just what is going on in the field in terms of access, funding, and overall support for community colleges? This report summarizes perceptions of state community college leaders, and is offered as a “barometer” of the current situation and future prospects for community college funding.

Those surveyed include the 51 members of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges (NCSDDC).<sup>1</sup> They were surveyed because of their knowledge, experience, and perspectives regarding issues of funding, organization, governance, and access related not only to community colleges, but also to the larger context of state policy in a dynamic, rapidly changing policy environment. An expert panel reviewed the survey instrument after its initial development in 2003<sup>2</sup>, updated by the authors in 2004. The University of North Texas’ Institutional Review Board approved the instrument.

Survey results include perceptions about the current budgetary situation and predictions for the next year or two. Responses from 50 states were received<sup>3</sup>. Key findings and state-by-state responses are provided for each item. Listed in bold are the 9 “megastates” (California, Texas, New York, Illinois, Florida, North Carolina, Ohio, Michigan, and Pennsylvania) that collectively appropriate approximately half of all state tax dollars for public higher education and enroll 52% of all community college students. (<http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/tables/dt209.asp>)

Survey responses should be interpreted in light of the following. (1) State directors or individuals designated to answer this survey could choose whether or not to respond to each item; variations in response rates exist for each survey item. (2) Respondents had opportunities to make illustrative qualitative comments, which are recorded in footnotes to the data tables. (3) Results presented are perceptions, not actual measures, and there is no way to insure accuracy of those perceptions. It can be assumed state directors of community colleges are more knowledgeable about issues related to their own sector of education than others, however all responses are, in fact, estimates. (4) Sub-items of questions 3, 4, 6, and 8 asking about Historically Black Colleges and Universities were removed due to low response rates.

The authors extend their sincere appreciation to the members of the NCSDDC, and in particular to Martin Lancaster, President of the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges. The high response rate is a reflection of their interest in this work. The authors also wish to thank students in the University of North Texas Higher Education Program who assisted in data collection: Kim Brown, Henrietta Egenti, Amina El-Ashmawy, Kizuwanda Gayden, Ashley Lyon, Frank Maldonado, Kevin Montgomery, Jeremy Posey, Stephanie Sarles, and Quentin Wright. Any errors in the tabulation, analysis, and reporting of survey results is the sole responsibility of the authors.

---

1 Individuals surveyed were listed on the NCSDDC website (<http://www.statedirectors.org/directors/ncsdcc.htm>). Georgia's response was from its University System of Georgia, which operates a community college system, and not from its technical college system under Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education.

2 The authors wish to thank the following for reviewing the 2003 instrument that, with modifications, was used in 2004: Allen Cissell, former Senior Program Officer, US Department of Education; Gary Davis, Executive Director, Illinois Community College Trustees Association; James Folkening, Director, Postsecondary Services, Michigan Department of Career Development; and Robert P. Pedersen, former Senior Editor, Community College Week. The authors also thank UNT Higher Education students who pilot-tested this survey: Sondra Flemming, Rodney Garrett, Zena Jackson, Doug Jefferson, Pablo Pasquale, Jennie Pollard, and Czarina Reyes.

3 New York's response was from the State University of New York, and not the City University of New York. Responses for Arizona, New Jersey, and New Mexico came from their state associations of community colleges. Indiana's response was from Ivy Tech and not Vincennes University.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### I. The current situation for Fiscal Year 2004:

- \* **An improved budget situation, but last year was very bad.** Fewer state directors reported mid-year budget cuts in FY2004 (12) than in FY2003 (34), reflecting an improved budgetary situation. When mid-year cuts were made, most were across-the-board for all sectors (community colleges, regional universities, and flagship universities). It should be noted that local tax support was not factored into responses (see Tables 2A/2B).
- \* **Strong competition exists for scarce dollars; Medicaid is the #1 key driver.** In most states, higher education is the largest discretionary item in the entire state budget, and the competition is fierce for scarce state tax dollars. State directors report Medicaid as the key driver of state budgets (46 states, or 94%). Increases in K-12 funding (43 states or 91% of states responding) and revenue shortfalls due to recession (38 states or 83% of states reporting), were also ranked high as primary state budget drivers (see Table 4).

### II. Prospects for the next year (Fiscal Year 2005)/next two years:

- \* **Tuition increases are a predominant method by which states deal with declining state revenues for public higher education.** Nearly every state director predicted tuition increases for community colleges (44 of 47 reporting, or 94%). Similarly large percentages of respondents predicted increases for regional and flagship universities. These results mirror findings for 2003, when all 45 states responding predicted tuition increases (see Tables 3A/3B/3C).
- \* **Access is less threatened than last year, but challenges remain.** Last year, a majority of state directors predicted enrollment caps, class section limitations, and reductions or closing of summer sections in the following 2003-2004 academic year. The situation is improved for 2004-2005, with only 5 predicting that their community colleges would take such actions. All of the signs are not good, however: 10 states, or 25% indicated their regional universities would limit access in some way, and 11 states, or 29%, indicated their flagship universities would do the same. It is noteworthy that most of the state directors reporting that public universities might turn away students were in states that have experienced large increases in their high school graduation class size coinciding with "Tidal Wave II" (See Table 5 and Chart 1 immediately following Table 5).
- \* **Given the tuition increases, a mixed picture of state direct grant aid to students emerges.** Twenty of 43 state directors (47%) predict that total state-funded direct grant aid across all sectors of postsecondary education will increase from FY2004 to FY2005; 20 or 47% predict that direct aid will remain flat, and 3 or 7% predict that direct aid will be cut (see Table 8). While direct grant aid programs vary widely across states, and respondents were not asked to provide estimated percentages, it is troubling that fewer than half of the state directors predict increases in total state direct grant aid at a time when greater than 9 in 10 predict higher tuition rates for each sector of public higher education (community colleges, regional universities, and flagship universities) in their states.

- \* **Rural community colleges face the greatest budgetary strain.** When asked which colleges--rural, suburban, or urban--would face the greatest fiscal strain in FY 2004-2005, more state directors indicated that rural colleges would face the greatest difficulties. Lower access to local tax millage likely means fewer options to replace declining state revenues. This finding is tempered by the fact that variability exists across the states; not all states indicated that rural institutions were the most likely to be hurt. (See Table 6).
- \* **Total state support for 2004-2005 will increase, but is still problematic.** Thirty (63%) of 48 reporting states anticipate funding increases for their community colleges next year. This compares to 8 (17%) that anticipate flat funding, and 10 (21%) that anticipate funding decreases. Across all states, the mean average perceived increase for the community college sector was +2% (47 states reporting), for regional universities it was +3% (35 states reporting), and for flagship universities +2% (33 states reporting). Given the 1.9% inflation rate for 2003 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (<http://www.bls.gov/news.release/pdf/cpi.pdf>), and the fact that some states are dealing with large growth states in numbers of high school graduates (see Chart 1 following Table 5, below), it can be said that the funding picture has improved over last year, but is still problematic (see Tables 7A, 7B, and 7C).
- \* **Most community college functions remain relatively stable, though workforce training and developmental education appear to be slightly more vulnerable.** When asked how specific community college functions would fare in FY 2004-2005, the picture that emerges is one of stability and little change. Most state directors reported that the general education/transfer function and the career/technical education function would stay the same, 33 and 35 states respectively, while directors in 13 and 9 states (respectively) predicted a strengthening of these functions. Non-credit functions, such as community services courses and non-credit federally funded workforce training may in some cases be threatened, however. In the case of federally funded, non-credit workforce training, 8 states (18%) indicated that this function is in jeopardy of being weakened, 31 (71%) indicated that it would stay the same, and just 5 (11%) indicated that it would be strengthened. More states feared that developmental education would be weakened (9 states) than strengthened (6 states). These results suggest that cuts in community services, workforce education, and developmental education are sometimes used to avoid cuts in the more traditional degree functions (see Table 9)
- \* **Major restructuring is not likely to occur, but the environment is fluid.** Only 4 directors predicted a significant restructuring of state-level governance and coordination; 43 did not. This suggests a relative stability in state structures, although California, which enrolls a large proportion of community college students nationwide, is one of states anticipating possible changes at the state level. These findings should be viewed in light of the fact that significant restructuring has recently occurred in some states (Table 10).
- \* **Coordination and governance of community colleges is highly varied across the states.** No one model of coordination and governance exists across the 50 states. (Table 11)

**STATE FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES:  
PERCEPTIONS FROM THE FIELD**  
*RESULTS OF A SURVEY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE  
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE DIRECTORS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES*

**Survey Question 1) What are the beginning and ending dates for the budget in your state?**

<b>Table 1</b> <b>Perceptions of State Directors About Their State's Budget Cycle</b> <b>(states reporting = 50)</b>		
<b>Ending Date of June 30, Beginning Date of July 1 45 states (80%)</b>	<b>Ending Date of September 30, Beginning date of October 1 2 states (4%)</b>	<b>Other 3 states (6%)</b>
AK, AR, AZ, <b>CA</b> , CO, CT, DE, <b>FL</b> , GA, HI, IA, ID, <b>IL</b> , IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, MT, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, <b>OH</b> , OK, OR, <b>PA</b> , RI, SC, SD, TN, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV, WY	AL, <b>MI</b>	NC – Ends & Begins in Early January NY – Ending Date March 31, Beginning Date April 1 TX – Ending Date August 31, Beginning Date of September 1
<p>Note: States noted in bold are the “megastates” that account for over 50% of state tax appropriations for higher education. These same states comprise 58% of total community college enrollments. They are: CA, FL, IL, MI, NC, NY, OH, PA, &amp; TX</p>		

**Survey Question 2) *Were mid-year budgets cuts made in your state's Fiscal Year 2003-2004 appropriations for the following education sectors? (Please estimate in percentage terms if possible)***

<b>Table 2A</b>			
<b>Perceptions of State Directors About Mid-Year Budget Cuts in Fiscal Year 2003-2004</b>			
<b>Summary of Responses by Educational Sector</b>			
<b>Sector</b>	<b>NO Mid-year Cuts</b>	<b>YES, Mid-year Cuts</b>	<b>Don't Know / No Response</b>
<b>Elementary and Secondary Education (42 responses)</b>	<b>37 Responses (88%)</b>	<b>5 Responses (12%)</b>	<b>8 Don't Know/ No Response</b>
<b>Community Colleges (48 responses)</b>	<b>36 Responses (74%)</b>	<b>12 Responses (26%)</b>	<b>2 Don't Know/ No Response</b>
<b>Regional Universities (44 responses)</b>	<b>32 Responses (73%)</b>	<b>12 Responses (27%)</b>	<b>6 Don't Know/ No Response</b>
<b>Flagship Universities (45 responses)</b>	<b>33 Responses (73%)</b>	<b>12 Responses (27%)</b>	<b>4 Don't Know/ No Response</b>
Notes: (1) While responses to the survey were received from all 50 states, not every state director responded to each individual survey item. (2) The original question for this item asked respondents to estimate the sector "Historically Black Colleges and Universities." Due to low response rates, this item was removed from Tables 2A-B			

**Table 2B**  
**Perceptions of State Directors About Mid-Year Budget Cuts in Fiscal Year 2003-2004**  
**Detailed Responses by Sector**

Sector	NO	YES		Don't Know/ No Response
	Mid-year Cuts	Mid year Cuts	Estimated % of Cuts	
<b>Elementary and Secondary Education</b> (42 responses)	<b>37 Responses (88%)</b> AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, MA, MD, ME, MN, MS, MT, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, PA, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV	<b>5 Responses (12%)</b> IA, KY, MI, MO, SC	IA (-2.25), KY (-2.5), MI (-2), NE (-2), SC (-1)	<b>8 responses</b> CT, GA, LA, NC, OK, OH, OR, WY
<b>Community Colleges</b> (48 responses)	<b>36 Responses (74%)</b> AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, MA, MD, MN, MS, MT, ND, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OR, PA, RI, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV, WY	<b>12 Responses (26%)</b> GA, IA, KY, LA, ME, MI, MO, NC, NE, OH, SC, VA	GA (-2.5), IA (-2.25), KY (-2.5), LA (-.08), ME (-1), MI (-8.3), MO (-2.78), NE (-2), NC (-2), OH (-0.58), SC (-1), VA (-10)	<b>2 responses</b> OK, SD
<b>Regional Universities</b> (44 responses)	<b>32 Responses (73%)</b> AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, HI, ID, IN, KS, MA, MD, MN, MS, MT, ND, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, PA, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WV	<b>12 Responses (27%)</b> GA, IA, IL, KY, ME, MI, MO, NC, NE, OH, SC, VA	GA (-2.5), IA (-2.25), IL (-2), KY (-2.5), ME (-1), MI (-8.4), MO (-3.75), NC (-2), NE (-2), OH (-0.59), SC (-1), VA (-12 to 14)	<b>6 responses</b> CT, LA, OK, OR, WI, WY
<b>Flagship Universities</b> (45 responses)	<b>33 Responses (73%)</b> AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, HI, ID, IN, KS, MD, MA, MN, MS, MT, ND, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, PA, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV	<b>12 Responses (27%)</b> GA, IA, IL, KY, ME, MI, MO, NC, NE, OH, SC, VA	GA (-2.5) IA (-2.25), IL (-2), KY (-2.5), ME (-1), MI (-8.4), MO (-2.58), NC (-2), NE (+2), OH (-1.29), SC (-1), VA (-20),	<b>4 responses</b> OK, OR, CT, WY

*Please provide any additional comments that you wish regarding the funding situation in your state, including any observations on the overall funding climate in your state:* AK – Although there were no mid-year budgets cut during FY03/04 all education sectors prepared for severe cuts for FY04/05. The legislature and governor’s office threatened severe cuts but in the end most sectors came out balanced. Increased oil prices (AK is dependent on the \$\$ per barrel) during the past nine months allowed for the cuts to be minimal. AZ – K-12 state appropriations are fully protected by a voter initiative passed in 2000; hence, K-12 funding cannot be cut by state legislators. The voter initiative further required the state legislature to fund K-12 inflation annually at 2%. In FY03-04, AZ lawmakers faced a \$1B deficit in a \$6.2B budget. IL – community college budget is 3.3% less than FY 04. MI –if colleges and universities hold tuition to cost of living (2.37), they individually get 3% state aid restored MO – these reductions were in addition to the standard 3% governor's reserve. The withholdings indicated above were released in April 2004. PA – the economy is making some recovery and state revenues are improving slightly. SC – given the three successive years of overall budget reduction in SC, K-12 will likely receive the highest priority for restoration of state funding for the next several years. Postsecondary institutions will continue to be dependent upon the capacity to raise fees to sustain operations

**Survey Question 3) Please provide your best estimate as to the percentage increase/decrease in tuition within each sector of higher education from the 2003-2004 to 2004-2005 Fiscal Years:**

<b>Table 3A Perceptions of State Directors Regarding Changes in Tuition from FY 2004 to FY 2005 Summary</b>				
<b>Sector</b>	<b>Increase In tuition</b>	<b>Flat Tuition (Stayed the same)</b>	<b>Decrease in tuition</b>	<b>Don't Know / No Response</b>
<b>Community Colleges 47 responses (average: + 7%)</b>	<b>44 Responses (94%)</b> AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY	<b>1 Response (2%)</b> ME	<b>2 Responses (4%)</b> MA, WV	<b>3 Don't Know/ No Response</b> MO, SD, PA
<b>Regional Universities 42 responses (average: +9%)</b>	<b>40 Responses (95%)</b> AK, AL, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, MD, ME, MI, MN, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, OH, OK, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI	<b>1 Response (2%)</b> NY	<b>1 Response (2%)</b> WV	<b>8 Don't Know/ No Response</b> AR, LA, MA, MO, MS, OR, RI, WY
<b>Flagship Universities 40 responses (average: +10%)</b>	<b>39 Responses (98%)</b> AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, HI, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, MD, ME, MI, MN, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WA, WI	<b>0 Responses (0%)</b>	<b>1 Response (3%)</b> WV	<b>10 Don't Know/ No Response</b> DE, IA, LA, MA, MO, MS, OR, PA, VT, WY
Notes: (1) While responses to the survey were received from all 50 states, not every state director responded to each individual survey item. (2) Percentages may not add to 100.0% due to rounding. (3) The original question for this item asked respondents to estimate tuition changes for "Historically Black Colleges and Universities." Due to low response rates, these estimates are not reported in Tables 3A, 3B, or 3C.				



<b>Table 3B</b>							
<b>Perceptions of State Directors Regarding Changes in Tuition from FY 2004 to FY 2005</b>							
<b>Summary of Percentage Changes by Sector of Public Higher Education</b>							
<b>Community Colleges</b> 47 responses (average: +7%)	<b>Decrease</b> 2 states (4%)		<b>Flat</b> 1 state (2%)	<b>Increase</b> 44 states (94%)			
	<b>Decrease</b> ≤ -5 Percent	<b>Decrease</b> -0.1 to -4.9 Percent	<b>Flat</b> 0 Percent	<b>Increase</b> +0.1 to 2.9 Percent	<b>Increase</b> +3.0 to 5.9 Percent	<b>Increase</b> +6.0 to 9.9 Percent	<b>Increase</b> ≥ 10 Percent
	2 states (4%)		1 state (2%)	2 states (4%)	16 states (34%)	15 states (32%)	11 states (23%)
<b>Regional Universities</b> 41 responses (average: +9%)	<b>Decrease</b> 1 state (2%)		<b>Flat</b> 1 state (2%)	<b>Increase</b> 40 states (95%)			
	<b>Decrease</b> ≤ -5 Percent	<b>Decrease</b> -0.1 to -4.9 Percent	<b>Flat</b> 0 Percent	<b>Increase</b> +0.1 to 2.9 Percent	<b>Increase</b> +3.0 to 5.9 Percent	<b>Increase</b> +6.0 to 9.9 Percent	<b>Increase</b> ≥ 10 Percent
	1 state (3%)		1 state (3%)	2 states (5%)	7 states (18%)	18 states (45%)	13 states (28%)
<b>Flagship Universities</b> 39 responses (average: +10%)	<b>Decrease</b> 1 state (3%)		<b>Flat</b> 0 states (0%)	<b>Increase</b> 38 states (98%)			
	<b>Decrease</b> ≤ -5 Percent	<b>Decrease</b> -0.1 to -4.9 Percent	<b>Flat</b> 0 Percent	<b>Increase</b> +0.1 to 2.9 Percent	<b>Increase</b> +3.0 to 5.9 Percent	<b>Increase</b> +6.0 to 9.9 Percent	<b>Increase</b> ≥ 10 Percent
	1 state (3%)			3 states (8%)	5 states (13%)	17 states (43%)	14 states (35%)

<b>Table 3C</b>							
<b>Perceptions of State Directors Regarding Changes in Tuition from FY 2004 to FY 2005,</b>							
<b>Detailed Responses for Community Colleges</b>							
<b>State</b>	<b>Percent</b> (+ or =)	<b>State</b>	<b>Percent</b> (+ or =)	<b>State</b>	<b>Percent</b> (+ or =)	<b>State</b>	<b>Percent</b> (+ or =)
AK	+18	IL	+7	NC	+7	SC	+13.93
AL	+7.14	IN	+4	ND	+9 to +16	SD	N/A
AR	+5.1	KS	5	NE	+6.2	TN	+7
AZ	+16	KY	+16.5	NH	+12	TX	+19.1
CA	+44	LA	+7	NJ	+3.8	UT	+9.2
CO	+1.1	MA	-35	NM	+5.51	VA	+7
CT	+4.1	MD	+7	NV	+4	VT	+5.5
DE	+5.5	ME	0	NY	+4	WA	+7
FL	+5	MI	+2.3	OH	+5.4	WI	+8.6
GA	+5	MN	+13.6	OK	+10.6	WV	-5.9
HI	+4	MO	N/A	OR	+5	WY	+4
IA	+7.12	MS	+10.03	PA	Varies		
ID	+8.6	MT	+9 to +10	RI	+9		

**Survey Question 4) Many states are facing a tough budgetary situation. Please provide a reaction to the following drivers that are influencing the budget process in your state, by answering important or not important to each item.**

<b>Medicaid Increases (49 responses)</b>		<b>Elementary and Secondary Education Increases (47 responses)</b>		<b>Recession, Producing a Decline in State Revenue (46 responses)</b>		<b>Corrections Increases (43 responses)</b>		<b>Higher Education Increases (44 responses)</b>		<b>Unemployment Insurance Increases (36 responses)</b>	
<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>Not Important</b>
<b>46 States (94%)</b>	<b>3 States (6%)</b>	<b>43 States (91%)</b>	<b>4 States (9%)</b>	<b>38 States (83%)</b>	<b>8 States (17%)</b>	<b>30 States (70%)</b>	<b>13 States (30%)</b>	<b>26 States (59%)</b>	<b>18 States (41%)</b>	<b>8 States (22%)</b>	<b>28 States (78%)</b>
AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MO, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV	MN, PA, WY	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MO, MS, MT, NC, ND, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV	IN, MI, MN, WY	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KY, LA, MA, ME, MI, MN, MS, MO, NC, NE, NJ, NY, OH, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, VT, WA, WI, WV,	MD, MT, ND, NH, NM, UT, VA, WY	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, IN, LA, MD, MS, MT, MO, NH, OH, OK, OR, RI, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI	IL, MA, ME, MI, MN, ND, NJ, NY, PA, SC, UT, WY	AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CT, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, NY, OH, OK, OR, SD, UT, VA, VT, WA	CO, IL, IN, MD, ME, MN, MO, MS, MT, ND, NH, NJ, RI, PA, SC, WI, WY	AR, ID, MA, MI, MO, SD, VT, WA	AK, AZ, CO, FL, IA, IL, IN, LA, MD, ME, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OK, PA, RI, SC, TX, UT, VA, WI, WV

Notes: (1) While responses to the survey were received from all 50 states, not every state director responded to each individual survey item. (2) State specific notes: IN – Property Tax Relief was an important driver; MD – Structural Budget Deficit was an important driver; MI – implementation of tax reduction accumulates in previous years; ND – Use of one-time trust funds was an important driver; OK – Insurance risk management was an important driver ; OR - The Oregon Health Plan was an important driver influencing the state budget; VA – Transportation was an important driver influencing the state budget; WI – state budget structural deficit, tribal gaming compact disputes.

Survey Question 5) Do you predict that the following sectors of public higher education will cap enrollments, limit credit class sections, or close/reduce summer offerings in 2004-2005? (Please check all that apply)

<b>Table 5</b>			
<b>State Directors' Predictions About Efforts to</b>			
<b>Cap Enrollment, Limit Class Sections, or Close/Reduce Summer Offerings in 2004-2005</b>			
<b>Sector</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>Don't Know/No response</b>
<b>Community Colleges (45 responses)</b>	<b>5 Responses (11%)</b> HI, IA, MI, NC, WA	<b>40 Responses (89%)</b> AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, ID, IL, IN, KS, LA, MA, MD, ME, MS, MT, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WI, WV, WY	<b>5 Don't Know /No Response</b> GA, KY, MN, MO, SD
<b>Regional Universities (40 responses)</b>	<b>10 Responses (25%)</b> CA, HI, IA, MI, NC, NJ, NY, TN, WA, WI	<b>30 Responses (75%)</b> AK, AL, AR, AZ, CO, CT, FL, ID, IL, IN, KS, MD, ME, MS, MT, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, OH, OK, PA, SC, SD, TX, UT, VA, VT, WV	<b>10 Don't Know /No Response</b> DE, GA, KY, LA, MA, MN, MO, OR, RI, WY
<b>Flagship Universities (38 responses)</b>	<b>11 Responses (29%)</b> AZ, CA, CT, HI, NC, NJ, NY, TN, UT, WA, WI	<b>27 Responses (71%)</b> AK, AL, AR, CO, FL, ID, IL, IN, KS, MD, ME, MS, MT, ND, NE, NH, NM, NV, OH, OK, PA, RI, SC, SD, TX, VA, WV	<b>12 Don't Know /No Response</b> DE, GA, IA, KY, LA, MA, MI, MN, MO, OR, VT, WY

Notes: (1) While responses to the survey were received from all 50 states, not every state director responded to each item. (2) The original question asked respondents for perceptions of conditions at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Because of low response rates, these were not included. (3) Other: AZ – CC's have never looked to cap enrollments, but many colleges have had to limit credit class sections; HI – No enrollment caps, but only a limited number of class sections will be offered; MI – they live within their revenues and reduce where necessary; WI – colleges operate with open enrollment, although some course sections/programs may have waiting lists.

<b>Chart 1</b>	
<b>Growth in high school graduates, actual and projected, 1993-4 to 2005-6</b>	
	<b>States (33)</b>
<b>States with percentage increases in high school graduates above 10%, 1993-94 to 1999-2000</b>	AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, HI, IA, LA, KS, MA, MD, MN, MO, MT, NE, ND, NH, NJ, NM, NV, OK, OR, PA, RI, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI
	<b>States (15)</b>
<b>States with projected percentage increases in high school graduates above 10%, 1999-2006</b>	AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, FL, GA, MA, MD, NC, NH, NJ, NV, RI, VA
Source: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common core of data surveys and state public high school graduates model. Table 25. Percent change in number of public high school graduates, by region and state, with projections: 1993–94 to 2011–12 (May 2002.) Weblink: <a href="http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/proj2012/table_25.asp">http://www.nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/proj2012/table_25.asp</a> (accessed 6/27/03).	

**Survey Question 6) Which of the following types of community colleges in your state will experience the greatest fiscal strain during the 2004-2005 fiscal year? Please rank order the following, with 1 representing colleges experiencing the greatest strain, and 3 representing colleges experiencing the least strain:**

- Rural Community Colleges*
- Suburban Community Colleges*
- Urban Community Colleges*

	<b>Greatest Strain</b>	<b>Moderate Strain</b>	<b>Least Strain</b>
<b>Rural Community Colleges (35 responses)</b>	<b>26 responses (74%)</b> AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, IA, ID, KS, MD, ME, MN, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NM, NY, OH, OK, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA, WV	<b>6 responses (17%)</b> FL, IL, MA, NV, WA, WI	<b>3 responses (9%)</b> AK, LA, MS
<b>Suburban Community Colleges (29 responses)</b>	<b>2 responses (7%)</b> TN, WA	<b>14 responses (48%)</b> AK, AL, CA, IA, KS, LA, MN, MS, MT, ND, NM, OK, SC, VA	<b>13 responses (45%)</b> AR, CO, FL, IL, MA, MD, ME, NE, NH, NY, OH, TX, WI
<b>Urban Community Colleges (32 responses)</b>	<b>10 responses (31%)</b> AK, FL, HI, IL, LA, MA, MS, NV, TN, WI	<b>11 responses (34.5%)</b> AR, AZ, CO, MD, ME, NC, NE, NH, NY, OH, TX	<b>11 responses (34.5%)</b> AL, CA, IA, KS, MN, ND, NM, OK, SC, VA, WA
Notes: (1) While responses to the survey were received from all 50 states, not every state director responded to every item in the survey. (2) States that did not answer this question were DE, GA, MI, MO, NJ, OR, SD, WY. (3) States that did not answer for suburban community colleges were AZ, NC, and NV.			

**Survey Question 7) Please estimate the percentage change (increase or decrease) in total state support from Fiscal Year 2003-2004 to 2004-2005 for each of the following educational sectors (please mark “don’t know” if appropriate):**

<u>(+ or - %)</u>	<u>Don't know</u>
_____ % <i>Elementary and Secondary Education</i>	_____
_____ % <i>Community Colleges</i>	_____
_____ % <i>Regional Universities</i>	_____
_____ % <i>Flagship Universities</i>	_____

<b>Table 7A</b>				
<b>State Director's Estimated Changes in Total State Support</b>				
<b>from Fiscal Year 2003-2004 to 2004-2005,</b>				
<b>by Sector of Education</b>				
<b>Summary</b>				
	Increase	Flat	Decrease	Don't Know / No Response
<b>Elementary and Secondary Education</b> (25 responses)	<b>22 Responses (88%)</b> AL, AZ, CA, CO, DE, <b>FL</b> , ID, IN, MD, ME, MS, MT, NC, ND, NM, NY, OK, PA, SC, TX, VA, WA	<b>2 Responses (8%)</b> MI, NE	<b>1 Response (4%)</b> MN	<b>27 Don't Know / No Response</b> AK, AR, CT, GA, HI, IA, <b>IL</b> , KS, KY, LA, MA, MO, MT, NH, NJ, NV, <b>OH</b> , OR, RI, SD, TN, UT, VA, VT, WI, WV, WY
<b>Community Colleges</b> (48 responses)	<b>30 Responses (63%)</b> AL, AR, AZ, CA, CT, DE, <b>FL</b> , IA, ID, <b>IL</b> , IN, KS, LA, MD, MO, NC, NJ, NM, NV, <b>OH</b> , OK, OR, PA, SD, <b>TX</b> , UT, VA, VT, WA, WY	<b>8 Responses (16.5%)</b> CO, KY, ME, <b>MI</b> , MT, NY, TN, WI	<b>10 Responses (20.5%)</b> AK, GA, MA, MN, MS, ND, NE, NH, SC, WV	<b>4 Don't Know / No Response</b> HI, ME, MT, RI
<b>Regional Universities</b> (37 responses)	<b>23 Responses (62%)</b> AL, AZ, CT, DE, <b>FL</b> , ID, IN, KS, MT, MO, NC, NH, NM, NV, <b>OH</b> , OK, PA, SD, <b>TX</b> , UT, VA, VT, WA	<b>9 Responses (24%)</b> CA, CO, <b>IL</b> , KY, MD, ME, <b>MI</b> , NY, TN	<b>5 Responses (14%)</b> GA, MN, NE, SC, WV	<b>15 Don't Know / No Response</b> AK, AR, HI, IA, LA, MA, MS, MT, ND, NJ, OR, RI, TN, WI, WY
<b>Flagship Universities</b> (35 responses)	<b>24 Responses (69%)</b> AL, AR, AZ, CT, <b>FL</b> , GA, ID, IN, KS, MN, MO, MT, NC, NH, NM, NV, NY, OK, PA, SD, <b>TX</b> , UT, VA, WA	<b>7 Responses (20%)</b> CA, CO, <b>IL</b> , KY, MD, ME, TN	<b>4 Responses (11%)</b> NE, <b>OH</b> , SC, WV	<b>15 Don't Know / No Response</b> AK, DE, HI, IA, LA, MA, <b>MI</b> , MS, MT, ND, NJ, OR, RI, VT, WI, WY
Notes: (1) While responses to the survey were received from all 50 states, not every state director responded to each individual survey item. (2) The original question asked respondents for perceptions of conditions at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Because of low response rates, these were not included in Tables 7A & 7B.				

**Table 7B**  
**State Directors' Estimates of Predicted Change in Total State Support**  
**from Fiscal Year 2003-2004 to 2004-2005, by Educational Sector and**  
**by Percentage (Increase/Flat/Decrease)**

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Decrease ≤ -5 Percent</b>	<b>Decrease -0.1 to -4.9 Percent</b>	<b>Flat 0 Percent</b>	<b>Increase +0.1 to 2.9 Percent</b>	<b>Increase +3.0 to 5.9 Percent</b>	<b>Increase +6.0 to 9.9 Percent</b>	<b>Increase ≥ 10 Percent</b>
<b>K-12 Education 25 states</b>		MN	MI, NE	AZ, CA, CO, ID, IN, ME, MN, MS, MT, OK, WA	MS, ND, SC	AL, DE, FL, MD, NC, NM, PA, TX	NY
<b>Community Colleges 48 states</b>	AK, MA, NH, WV	GA, MS, MN, ND, NE, SC	CO, KY, ME, MI, MT, NY, TN, WI	AR, AZ, IA, ID, IL, MO, TX, UT, VT	AL, CT, LA, MD, OK, PA, WA	CA, DE, IN, KS, NC, NJ, NM, NV, WY	FL, OH, VA
<b>Regional Universities 37 states</b>	CA, GA, WV	GA, MN, NE, SC, TX	CO, IL, KY, MD, ME, MI, NY, TN	AZ, IN, MO, MT, OH, UT, VT	AL, CT, DE, ID, IN, KS, NC, NH, NV, OK, NV, PA, SD, VA, WA	FL, NM, PA	NV
<b>Flagship Universities 35 states</b>	CA, WV	NE, OH, SC, TX	CO, IL, KY, MD, ME, TN	AR, AZ, GA, IN, MN, MT, NY, OK	AL, CT, ID, IN, KS, MO, NC, NH, NM, PA, SD, UT, VA, WA	FL, NV	

Notes: (1) Historically Black Colleges and Universities were not included in this item because of low response rates. (2) AZ – Community Colleges , growth funding only, Regional Universities, growth funding and salary increases, Flagships, growth funding and salary increases; IA – Community Colleges, including the June 2004 recession +2.67, 1/1%, not including the recession +2.95%; MS – Universities in general -.11%; MT – 2 year appropriations, not broken down by year; SD – 4.51% increase in a general fund supporting the public university system; TX - +11.44 all funds increase (1.41% general revenue decrease for all universities); VA - answered +? for K-12 Education.

**Survey Question 8) What was the percentage change from FY2004 to FY2005 in total state funded student direct grant aid across all of postsecondary education?**

\_\_\_\_\_ % (+ or - percentage)

<b>Table 8</b>	
<b>State Director's Estimates of Percentage Changes in Total State Funded Student Direct Grant Aid Across All Sectors of Postsecondary Education from FY2004 to FY2005</b>	
<b>43 States Responded</b>	
<b>Increase 21 states (49%)</b>	AR (+3%), AZ (+12%), CT (+3%), DE (+8), <b>FL</b> (+12%), IA (+7%), ID (+3), IN (+11), KS (+8%), KY (+6%), MD (+31%), <b>NC</b> (+10%), NJ (+10%), <b>OH</b> (+1%), OK (+15%), <b>PA</b> (+3%), SC (+8%), UT (+25%), VA (+?), WA (+13%), WY (+6%)
<b>Flat 19 states (44%)</b>	CO, GA, HI, MT, LA, MA, ME, <b>MI</b> , MN, MT, ND, NH, NV, NM, OR, SD, TN, TX, WV
<b>Decrease 3 states (7%)</b>	AK (-10%), MO (-1%), NE (-0.5%)
<b>Don't Know / No Response (7 states)</b>	AL, <b>IL</b> , MS, NY, RI, VT, WI
Notes: (1) While responses to the survey were received from all 50 states, not every state director responded to each individual survey item. (2) Percentages provided by state directors were rounded to nearest whole number, (3) percentage totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.	

**Survey Question 9) Given the current state of fiscal support, how will each of the following key functions of the community college fare in Fiscal Year 2004-2005? (Please mark as appropriate)**

<b>Table 9</b>			
<b>State Directors' Perceptions of How Community College Functions Will Fare in FY 2005</b>			
	<b>Strengthened</b>	<b>Stayed the Same</b>	<b>Weakened</b>
<b>General Education/Transfer (48 responses)</b>	<b>13 Responses (27%)</b> AK, CA, CT, FL, GA, IN, ME, ND, NJ, OH, OK, VA, WA	<b>33 Responses (69%)</b> AL, AR, AZ, CO, DE, HI, IA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MA, MD, MI, MN, MO, MT, NC, NE, NH, NM, NV, NY, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, WI, WY	<b>2 Responses (4%)</b> MS, WV
<b>Vocational/Occupational/ Technical Education (47 responses)</b>	<b>9 Responses (19%)</b> AL, AR, CA, FL, MA, MT, NJ, NM, VA	<b>35 Responses (75%)</b> AK, AZ, CT, DE, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KY, LA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, NC, ND, NE, NH, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, WI, WA, WY	<b>3 Responses (6%)</b> CO, MS, WV
<b>Non-Credit courses/ Community services (47 responses)</b>	<b>8 Responses (17 %)</b> AL, CA, MD, MT, NJ, NM, OK, VA	<b>31 Responses (66%)</b> AR, AZ, CT, DE, HI, ID, IL, IN, KY, LA, MA, ME, MI, MN, MO, ND, NH, NV, NY, OH, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WV, WY	<b>8 Responses (17%)</b> AK, CO, FL, IA, MS, NC, NE, OR
<b>Non-Credit federally supported workforce training (44 responses)</b>	<b>5 Responses (11%)</b> AL, MA, ND, NJ, OK	<b>31 Responses (71%)</b> AZ, CA, CO, DE, HI, IA, ID, IL, IN, KY, LA, MD, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NC, NH, NV, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WV, WY	<b>8 Responses (18%)</b> AK, FL, ME, NE, NM, NY, OR, WI
<b>Developmental/Remedial Education (49 responses)</b>	<b>6 Responses (12%)</b> AR, FL, IN, ND, NJ, VA	<b>33 Responses (67%)</b> AL, AK, AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, GA, ID, IL, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MT, NH, NM, OH, OK, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, UT, VT, WA, WI, WY	<b>10 Responses (20%)</b> HI, IA, MS, NC, NE, NV, NY, OR, WA, WV
Notes: (1) While responses to the survey were received from all 50 states, not every state director responded to each individual survey item. (2) States not responding to this question: KS, SD (3) Other -- CT indicated that Allied Health was strengthened.			



Survey Question 10) *Do you believe that significant restructuring of coordination and/or governance of community colleges and/or higher education may soon occur in your state?*

\_\_\_Yes      \_\_\_No

<b>Table 10</b> <b>Perceptions of State Directors About the Probability of Significant Restructuring of Coordination and/or Governance of Community Colleges and/or Higher Education in Near Future (47 states responding)</b>	
<b>YES</b> <b>4 states</b> <b>(9%)</b>	AZ, CA, ME, NM
<b>NO</b> <b>43 states</b> <b>(91%)</b>	AL, AK, CO, CT, DE, <b>FL</b> , GA, HI, IA, ID, <b>IL</b> , KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, <b>MI</b> , MN, MS, MT, MO, <b>NC</b> , ND, NE, NH, NJ, NV, <b>NY</b> , <b>OH</b> , OK, OR, <b>PA</b> , RI, SC, SD, TN, <b>TX</b> , UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV
<b>No Response</b> <b>3 states</b>	AR, IN, WY

**Survey Question 11) Please describe the types of state-level public educational coordinating/governing boards in your state. For purposes of this survey a governing board hires and fires institutional chief executives and a coordinating board does not. Both coordinating and governing boards generally have substantial authority over new program approval, obtaining and budgeting for state appropriations. For each educational sector below, please indicate a "C" for state-level coordinating board, a "G" for a state-level governing board, and an "N" for no state-level board:**  
**\_\_\_\_\_ K-12 schools \_\_\_\_\_ Community colleges \_\_\_\_\_ State universities**

**Table 12**  
**Perceptions of State Directors of the Types of State-Level Public Educational Coordinating/Governing Boards in the States**

	<b>State-Level Coordinating Board</b>	<b>State-Level Governing Board</b>	<b>No State-level Board</b>
<b>K-12 Schools (43 states)</b>	AZ, CO, CA, FL, DE, GA, IL, KS, MD, ME, MI, MO, MS, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NY, OH, OK, OR, SC, SD, TN, TX, WA, WV	AL, AK, AR, HI, ID, KS, KY, LA, MA, NC, ND, NV, RI, UT, VA	MN, PA, WI
<b>Community Colleges (50 states)</b>	AR, CT, CA, FL, IA, IL, IN, KS, MA, MD, MI, MS, MT, MO, NE, NH, NM, NY, OH, OK, SC, TX, WA, WV, WY	AL, AK, CO, DE, GA, HI, ID, KS, KY, LA, ME, MN, MT, NC, ND, NV, OK, OR, RI, TN, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WY	AZ, NJ, PA
<b>State Universities (46 states)</b>	AR, CT, FL, IL, IN, MA, MD, MI, MO, NE, NM, OH, OK, SC, TX, WA, WV	AK, AZ, CA, CO, DE, GA, HI, ID, KS, KY, LA, ME, MN, MS, MT, NC, ND, NH, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, RI, SD, TN, UT, VA, VT, WI	AL, NJ

Notes: (1) While responses to the survey were received from all 50 states, not every state director responded to each individual survey item. (2) State notes are as follows: AL – Alabama State Board of Education governs K-12 and the two-year college system. State universities are governed by individual boards of trustees; CO – K-12 section has local school boards which control districts. Policy controls only the state level; HI has a single governing board of community colleges and state universities; CT – Connecticut has a state coordinating board (Board of Governors) largely responsible for licensure and accreditation and some statewide higher education policy. Each of the four constituent units of higher education has its own state board--Community Colleges. University of Connecticut, Connecticut State University, and Charter Oak State College (external degrees). There is also a separate State Department of Education responsible for K-12 with its own Board. The community college system is a single state system funded by a state appropriation and student tuition and fees, with a single board, and no local boards nor local support; GA – the University System of Georgia Board of Regents governs the 13 two-year colleges and two state colleges in Georgia, as well as the 19 universities. There are no local or community governing boards for UGA colleges. A separate state governing board, the Board of the Department of Technical and Adult Education, governs 33 technical colleges, some of which are accredited to offer associate degrees in technical areas. K-12 schools are coordinated by a state Board of Education, with an elected state superintendent. MI- a single state board to plan and coordinate, and locally elected governing boards; MN – the governing board of the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities governs two -year colleges and state universities; MO – the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education coordinates the community colleges, state technical college, and state colleges and universities; MT – has both state wide governing board and local boards; NC – has separate boards for each area; NE – the coordinating commission for postsecondary education has state level, constitutionally– based program, facilities and planning authority for all sectors. In addition, separate governing boards exist for the 4 campuses of the University of Nebraska and for the three state colleges. OK – has a state-level coordinating board for all of higher education, and each institution also has its own governing board. SD – the Board of Regents governs six public universities and two special schools, one for the deaf and one for the blind and usually impaired. UT – both community colleges and state universities have one board; WA – None of these sectors has a board that hires/fires institutional personnel. Only the community and technical college board controls allocations of funds to its sector of education (K-12 is primarily formula funded and state universities receive their own direct appropriation). All of the boards have some varying control over program approval.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Stephen G. (Steve) Katsinas** is Don A. Buchholz Chair of Higher Education and Director of the Bill J. Priest Center for Community College Education at the University of North Texas. He received his Bachelor of Arts in History from the University of Illinois, and Master's in History and Doctorate in Higher Education from Southern Illinois University. He has previously worked at The University of Alabama, Miami-Dade College, Oklahoma State University, and the University of Toledo. His interests include access, finance, lay governance and state coordination, student financial aid, minority access, and rural higher education and economic development. He has personally visited more than 300 institutions of higher education in 34 states, and served on advisory committees of the Ford and W.K. Kellogg Foundations dealing with rural higher education issues. He works closely with the Rural Policy Research Institute at the Harry S Truman School of Public Affairs at the University of Missouri. He has authored more than 50 publications, and has made recent keynote speeches to state higher education groups in MN, MT, MO, WV, and other states. He is a past president of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, a council of the American Association of Community Colleges.

**James C. (Jim) Palmer** serves as professor of higher education at Illinois State University (ISU). Prior to joining the ISU faculty in 1992, he served as acting director of the Center for Community College Education at George Mason University, Vice President for Communications at the American Association for Community Colleges, and Assistant Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Community Colleges at UCLA. Palmer is a past president of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges, which is affiliated with the American Association of Community Colleges. In 1999, he became editor of the annual Grapevine survey of state appropriations to higher education. Grapevine is the oldest on-going, independently administered annual survey in US. higher education, having collected data related to state tax appropriations for public higher education since 1960.

**Terrence A. (Terry) Tollefson** is Professor and interim Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee. He has served as a community college faculty member, Faculty Senate President, and Director of Curriculum at Oakland Community College in Michigan. His state-level experience includes service as Associate Vice President for Policy and Planning in the North Carolina Department of Community Colleges, Director of the Junior and Community College Division of the National Laboratory for Higher Education and State Director of Community Colleges in both New Jersey and Colorado. He previously taught community college leadership at North Carolina State University, where he served as Editor of *Community College Review*. He is a former member of the Board of Directors and Chair of the Research Committee of The National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges, and he currently is an associate member of that organization. He is a past president of the Council for the Study of Community Colleges. He has co-edited and co-authored three books on state systems of community colleges. The 3rd book, *Fifty State Systems of Community Colleges*, was published in 1999 and he has recently initiated the process of writing the 4th edition of the state systems book. He also has published several book chapters, and numerous articles on issues related to community college education.

**Contact Information:**

Stephen G. Katsinas  
Don A. Buchholz Chair in Higher Education and  
Director, Bill J. Priest Center for Community College Education  
University of North Texas  
PO Box 310829  
Denton, TX 76203-0829  
tel: 940-369-6001  
fax: 940-369-7647  
email: [katsinas@unt.edu](mailto:katsinas@unt.edu)

Dr. James C. Palmer, Professor  
Department of Educational Administration and Foundations  
Campus Box 5900  
Illinois State University  
Normal, IL 61790-5900  
309/438-2041 (o)  
309/438-8683 (fax)  
E-Mail: [jcpalmer@ilstu.edu](mailto:jcpalmer@ilstu.edu)

Terrence A. Tollefson, Professor and Interim Chair  
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis  
East Tennessee State University  
Post Office Box 70550  
Johnson City, TN 37614-0554  
(423) 439-7617 (Work Phone)  
(423) 439-7636 (Work Fax)  
[tollefst@etsu.edu](mailto:tollefst@etsu.edu) (Work E-Mail)

**A Survey of the Funding Picture for Community Colleges in the States**

Hello. I am conducting a research survey on the current budget outlook for community college funding in the fifty states for the Bill J. Priest Center for Community College Education at the University of North Texas (Dr. Steve Katsinas, Director, PO Box 311337, Denton, TX 76203-1337, telephone: 940/369-6001, email: [katsinas@unt.edu](mailto:katsinas@unt.edu)). The Priest Center is conducting this research survey in conjunction with Dr. James C. Palmer, who directs GRAPEVINE at Illinois State University, and Dr. Terrence Tollefson, Professor and Interim Chair, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, East Tennessee State University. The survey should take about 10 minutes of your time. Each member of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges (NCSDDCC) will be contacted, and individual as well as group results will be made available to NCSDDCC members

1. Is your state's budget an annual or biennial budget?      \_\_\_ annual      \_\_\_ biennial

2. What are the beginning and ending dates for the budget in your state?  
 Beginning date: \_\_\_\_\_ Ending date: \_\_\_\_\_

3. Were mid-year budgets cuts made in your state's Fiscal Year 2003-2004 appropriations for the following education sectors (please estimate in percentage terms if possible):

	No	Yes	(if Yes, what ___%?)	Don't Know
Elementary and Secondary Education	___	___	___%	___
Community Colleges	___	___	___%	___
Historically Black Colleges & Us (if any)	___	___	___%	___
Regional Universities	___	___	___%	___
Flagship Universities	___	___	___%	___

Please provide any additional comments that you wish regarding the funding situation in your state, including any observations on the overall funding climate in your state:

4. Please provide your best estimate as to the percentage increase/decrease in tuition within each sector of higher education from the 2003-2004 to 2004-2005 fiscal years:

	Percentage (+/-)	<u>Don't Know</u>
Community Colleges	+/- _____%	_____
Historically Black Colleges and Us (if any)	+/- _____%	_____
Regional Universities	+/- _____%	_____
Flagship Universities	+/- _____%	_____

5. Many states are facing a tough budgetary situation. Please provide a reaction to the following drivers that are influencing the budget process in your state, by answering important or not important to each item.

Corrections increases	___important	___not important
Elementary and Secondary Education increases	___important	___not important
Higher Education increases	___important	___not important
Medicaid increases	___important	___not important
Recession, producing a decline in state revenue	___important	___not important
Unemployment Insurance increases	___important	___not important
Other, please specify_____	___important	___not important

6. Do you predict that the following sectors of public higher education will cap enrollments, limit credit class sections, or close/reduce summer offerings in 2004-2005? (please check all that apply):

	YES	NO	Don't Know
Community Colleges	___	___	___
Historically Black Colleges and Universities (if any in your state)	___	___	___
Regional Universities	___	___	___
Flagship Universities	___	___	___

Please add any comments that you might have:

7. Which of the following types of community colleges in your state will experience the greatest fiscal strain during the 2004-2005 fiscal year? Please rank order the following, with 1 representing colleges experiencing the greatest strain, and 3 representing colleges experiencing the least strain:

- \_\_\_ Rural Community Colleges
- \_\_\_ Suburban Community Colleges
- \_\_\_ Urban Community Colleges

Please add any comments that you might have:

8. Please estimate in your state the percentage change (increase or decrease) in total state support from Fiscal Year 2003-2004 to 2004-2005 for each of the following educational sectors (please mark "don't know" if appropriate):

(+ or - %)		Don't know
_____%	Elementary and Secondary Education	___
_____%	Community Colleges	___
_____%	Historically Black Colleges & Universities (if any)	___
_____%	Regional Universities	___
_____%	Flagship Universities	___

DRAFT, NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

9. What was the percentage change from FY2004 to FY2005 in total state funded student direct grant aid across all of postsecondary education? \_\_\_\_\_% (+ or – percentage)

10. Given the current state of fiscal support, how will each of the following key functions of the community college fare in Fiscal Year 2004-2005? (please mark as appropriate)

	Strengthened	Stay the Same	Weakened
General education/transfer	_____	_____	_____
Vocational/occupational/technical education	_____	_____	_____
Non-credit courses/community services	_____	_____	_____
Non-credit federally supported workforce training	_____	_____	_____
Developmental/remedial education	_____	_____	_____
Other function, please specify: _____	_____	_____	_____

Please add any thoughts regarding where other increases or cuts are occurring/will occur:

11. Do you believe that significant restructuring of coordination and/or governance of community colleges and/or higher education may soon occur in your state?

\_\_\_Yes      \_\_\_No

12. Please describe the types of state-level public educational coordinating/governing boards in your state. For purposes of this survey a governing board hires and fires institutional chief executives and a coordinating board does not. Both coordinating and governing boards generally have substantial authority over new program approval, obtaining and budgeting for state appropriations. For each educational sector below, please indicate a "C" for state-level coordinating board, a "G" for a state-level governing board, and an "N" for no state-level board:

\_\_\_K-12 schools      \_\_\_Community colleges      \_\_\_State universities

Please comment on any qualifications that are necessary, including any situation in which one state-level board coordinates and/or governs more than one educational sector.

Please explain your answer:

**THANK YOU** for taking time to fill out this survey. The results will be shared with the membership of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges.