

DATE: July 21, 2014
TO: House Appropriations Subcommittee on Higher Education
FROM: Kyle I. Jen, Deputy Director
RE: University Performance Funding Formula

Introduction

In FY 2011-12, a reduction of \$213.1 million (15.0%) was made to public university appropriations as part of budget balancing efforts. Over the subsequent three-year period (FYs 2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15), \$95.4 million in university funding increases have been allocated to individual universities using performance funding metrics. An additional \$37.3 million has been appropriated in the FY 2014-15 budget in proportion to FY 2010-11 university appropriation amounts, for a total increase of \$132.7 million since FY 2011-12.

The performance funding formula has been used only to allocate year-over-year funding increases to Michigan's 15 public universities. Base appropriations are not directly affected by the formula, although the performance increases for each year have been rolled into the university's base amounts for the subsequent year.

The original formula for FY 2012-13 was the product of a compromise between different formulas proposed by the administration, House, and Senate for that year.¹ Modifications were made to the formula as part of the FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15 budget processes. As the formula stands for the FY 2014-15 budget, it utilizes six performance metrics to allocate funding:

- Undergraduate degree completions in critical skills areas
- Research and development expenditures
- Six-year graduation rate
- Total degree completions
- Institutional support expenditures as a percentage of total core expenditures
- Pell Grant students

For the first two components listed, funds are allocated to the universities in direct proportion to the metric. For the final four components, each university receives a score based on how its performance compares to national public peers and funds are allocated in proportion to each university's total score, weighted by the size of the university's undergraduate enrollment.

Section 265a of the annual Higher Education budget act (MCL 388.1865a) describes the performance funding formula components in general terms, but the calculated performance funding amounts for each university are specifically appropriated in the budget act. These appropriation amounts are separate from the base ongoing operations appropriation for each university. Universities must comply with certain policy requirements in order to receive the performance funding amount.

¹ Information on university funding allocation methods utilized in years prior to FY 2011-12 can be found in this 2012 HFA memo on University Funding Policy:
http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa/PDF/HigherEducation/university_funding_policy_memo_feb12i.pdf.

More details on each of the performance metrics and requirements are provided below, focusing on the formula methodology utilized for the FY 2014-15 budget.² Footnotes provide information on the origins of each formula component and modifications that have been made since the original version of the formula was implemented.

Attachments to the memorandum show:

- FY 2014-15 university performance funding calculations (Attachment 1)³
- FY 2014-15 university scoring vs. national Carnegie peers (Attachment 2)
- University appropriation amounts for the period of FY 2010-11 to FY 2014-15 (Attachment 3)

Funding Proportional to FY 2010-11 Appropriations

As shown in Attachment 1, 50.0% of the overall FY 2014-15 funding increase, equal to \$37.3 million, is distributed in proportion to FY 2010-11 appropriation amounts in order to recognize the significant reduction in appropriations made from FY 2010-11 amounts in the FY 2011-12 budget. This has nearly the same effect as an across-the-board increase but provides slightly more funding to universities that received smaller funding increases in FYs 2012-13 and 2013-14 (and slightly less to those that received larger increases in those years).⁴

Undergraduate Degree Completions in Critical Skills Areas

For FY 2014-15, \$8.3 million (11.1% of the total university funding increase; 22.2% of performance-based funding) is allocated based on the number of undergraduate degrees and certificates completed at each university in a critical skills area. Average weighted completions included in this component totaled 14,901, so each university receives \$557 per completion.

Data for this component is taken from the federal IPEDS database.⁵ (The same data is also included in the state's HEIDI database.⁶) Calculations are made based on a two-year average for the most recent years available (FYs 2011-12 and 2012-13 for the FY 2014-15 formula.) For a number of universities, the number of annual completions moves up and down significantly every other year.

Completions are weighted based on the length of time it normally takes to complete the undergraduate degree or certificate. Degrees and certificates are weighted as follows:

Category	Weight
Bachelor's Degree	1.000
Associate's Degree	0.500
Certificates of more than 1 but less than 2 academic years	0.375
Certificates of less than 1 academic year	0.125

² The final enacted version of the FY 2014-15 Higher Education budget is based on precisely the same formula methodology proposed in the Executive Budget Recommendation. The total amount of funding allocated to the universities is, however, slightly lower than under that recommendation (5.9% increase vs. recommended 6.1%).

³ Performance funding calculations for FYs 2012-13 and 2013-14 can be found in these documents:

<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa/PDF/HigherEducation/HigherEdAppropsReport2013.pdf>

http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa/PDF/HigherEducation/hiedrept_fy14.pdf

⁴ The budgets for those two years did not include any kind of general funding increase for universities; all funds were allocated using performance metrics. The larger university funding increase in FY 2014-15—5.9% vs. 3.0% and 1.8% in the prior two years—helped allow for funding proportional to FY 2010-11 amounts.

⁵ IPEDS stands for "Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System." The IPEDS public website is available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/>.

⁶ HEIDI stands for "Higher Education Institutional Data Inventory." Summary HEIDI data is available at: http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa/PDF/HigherEducation/HEIDI_University_Summary_Data_fy08-09andfy12-13.pdf.

Program areas classified as “critical skills areas” are as follows:

- Agriculture, Agricultural Operations, and Related Sciences
- Architecture and Related Services
- Biological and Biomedical Sciences
- Communications Technologies/Technicians and Support Services
- Computer and Information Sciences and Support Services
- Engineering
- Engineering Technologies and Engineering-Related Fields
- Health Professions and Related Sciences
- Mathematics and Statistics
- Mechanic and Repair Technologies/Technicians
- Natural Resources and Conservation
- Physical Sciences
- Precision Production
- Science Technologies/Technicians
- Transportation and Materials Moving⁷

With some exceptions, these program areas generally have higher average instructional costs than program areas not classified as critical skills areas. For the last two years available, 27% of total undergraduate degree and certificate completions at the 15 universities were in critical skills areas.⁸

Research and Development Expenditures

For FY 2014-15, \$4.1 million (5.6% of the total university funding increase; 11.1% of performance-based funding) is allocated based on the level of research and development (R&D) expenditures made at each of the seven universities classified as a “research university” under the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education: Michigan State, UM-Ann Arbor, Wayne State, Michigan Tech, Western, Central, and Oakland. (More information on Carnegie Classifications is presented in the next section.) Research and development expenditures at the seven universities totaled \$1.3 billion, so the eligible universities receive performance funding at a rate of \$0.0032 per dollar of R&D expenditures.

Data for this component is taken from the federal IPEDS database based on the most recent year available (FY 2011-12 for the FY 2014-15 formula).⁹

Carnegie Peer Comparison-Based Metrics

For FY 2014-15, \$24.9 million (33.3% of the total university funding increase; 66.7% of performance-based funding) is based on four metrics under which universities are compared to their national peers. The four metrics are six-year graduate rate, total degree completions, institutional support as a

⁷ Degree and certificate completions are reported based on the federal Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP).

⁸ This component originated as a modified version of the House-passed Higher Education budget for FY 2012-13. That version of the formula included all undergraduate degree and certificate completions as a single funding component, weighting completions in critical skills areas at twice the value of degrees in other areas. For the final FY 2012-13 enacted budget, just the completions in critical skills areas were included as a funding component.

For FY 2012-13, degrees in accounting and certain multi/interdisciplinary studies combinations (biological/physical sciences, math/computer science) were also included as critical skills areas. Those areas were removed beginning in FY 2013-14, in part because they represent a finer level of CIP detail than the remaining critical skills areas.

⁹ This component originated as a new proposal included during conference committee negotiations for the FY 2012-13 Higher Education budget.

percentage of core expenditures, and Pell Grant students. Total weighted scoring across the four metrics is 1,825,242 points, so universities receive \$13.63 per weighted point.

Universities are scored on their performance relative to public universities across the nation that have been classified into the same Basic Classification under the system developed and periodically updated by the Carnegie Foundation.¹⁰ The primary basis for classification is the highest level (bachelor’s vs. master’s vs. doctoral) and quantity of instruction provided by a university. Level of research expenditure serves as a further basis for classification within the doctoral category. Under the 2010 edition of the classifications, Michigan’s universities are classified as follows:

2010 Basic Carnegie Classifications

Research Universities (very high research activity)	Michigan State University of Michigan - Ann Arbor Wayne State
Research Universities (high research activity)	Michigan Tech Western Michigan
Doctoral/Research Universities	Central Michigan Oakland
Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)	Eastern Michigan Ferris State Grand Valley Saginaw Valley University of Michigan - Dearborn University of Michigan - Flint
Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)	Northern Michigan
Baccalaureate Colleges–Diverse Fields	Lake Superior State

Scores for each of the four components are awarded as follows:

- 3 points for top 20 percent nationally
- 2 points for above the national median
- 2 points for improving over a 3-year period

Language in Section 265a states legislative intent that the score for “improving over a 3-year period” will be reduced to 1 point for the FY 2015-16 budget. (The same language was included in the FY 2013-14 budget, but the change was not implemented for FY 2014-15).¹¹

¹⁰ In recent years, the Carnegie Classification has been updated every five years, most recently in 2010. For more information, see this website: <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>.

¹¹ For FY 2012-13, scoring was 3 points for improving over three years, 2 points for top 20%, and 1 point for above national media. The current scoring amounts were adopted in FY 2013-14.

Scores are then totaled across the four Carnegie-based components and multiplied by the total number of undergraduate fiscal year equated students (FYES; a full-time equated measure of enrollment) at each university to correlate funding increases with university size. Both resident and nonresident students are included in the undergraduate FYES count. (Weighting based on FYES was not introduced until the FY 2012-13 budget. In FY 2011-12, smaller universities tended to receive larger percentage increases.) FYES data is taken from the state's HEIDI database, utilizing the most recent year available (FY 2012-13 for the FY 2014-15 budget).

The data utilized for comparisons with national peers is (by necessity) taken from the federal IPEDS database. This creates a longer data lag. For the FY 2014-15 budget, FY 2010-11 data is utilized for the comparisons, with improvement being measured from FY 2007-08 to FY 2010-11. (The exception is the Pell Grant component, for which the comparison is over a two-year period because reporting of the data to IPEDS is mandatory only every other year.)

Over the three years the performance formula has been utilized, all calculations for the Carnegie-based components have been conducted by the Andersen Economic Group in conjunction with the Business Leaders of Michigan and the Presidents Council, State Universities of Michigan. The State Budget Office and House and Senate Fiscal Agencies utilize the scoring provided by those organizations in determining appropriation amounts throughout the state budget process.¹²

The four Carnegie-based data components are as follows:

Six-Year Graduation Rate

Federal graduation rates measure the percentage of first-time, full-time, degree seeking students at an institution that complete a bachelor's degree within six years at the same institution. The rates are based on the group of students who started college six years prior to the year for which the rates are reported (FY 2004-05 for the FY 2010-11 rates). (Rates are also collected based on four- and five-year periods.) The subset of students included in the rate calculations does not include students transferring in from other institutions or enrolling on a part-time basis. A student transferring to another institution and completing a degree does not count as a successful completion at the original institution.

For the FY 2014-15 budget, four of the 15 universities were in the top 20% nationally for this measure and four were above the national median. Of the remaining seven universities, four had improved over the relevant three-year period. (See Attachment 2.)

Total Degree Completions

This data component captures total degree and certificate completions at each university, including both undergraduate and graduate programs. Degrees and certificates in all program areas are included. This is a gross measure of degree productivity, with no control for university size, so a smaller university will face a larger challenge in reaching the top-20% or median marks nationally.

¹² Three of the four Carnegie-based components were originally included in the Senate-passed version of the FY 2012-13 Higher Education budget, based a proposal made publicly by the Business Leaders of Michigan (BLM). That version of the formula included eight different Carnegie-based formula components. The exception among the four current components is the Pell Grant component, which was added in the FY 2014-15 budget (also with BLM's support). When the Pell Grant component was added, the percentage of total funding for each Carnegie-based component was reduced, rather than increasing the overall percentage for the Carnegie-based components.

As mentioned in the main text, the FYES weighting was added beginning with the FY 2013-14 budget. Prior to the FYES weighting, separate funding allocations were made for each Carnegie-based component.

BLM maintains university performance scorecards containing a larger number of data items at the following website: <http://mipublicuniversities.businessleadersformichigan.com/>.

For the FY 2014-15 budget, seven of the 15 universities were in the top 20% nationally for this measure and three were above the national median. Of the remaining five universities, two had improved over the relevant three-year period. (See Attachment 2.)

Institutional Support as a Percentage of Core Expenditures

This data component serves as a measure of administrative efficiency. Under the federal IPEDS database, “core expenditures” are defined (in part) as “Total expenses for the essential education activities of the institution.” Institutional support is defined as:

A functional expense category that includes expenses for the day-to-day operational support of the institution. Includes expenses for general administrative services, central executive-level activities concerned with management and long range planning, legal and fiscal operations, space management, employee personnel and records, logistical services such as purchasing and printing, and public relations and development. Also includes information technology expenses related to institutional support activities. If an institution does not separately budget and expense information technology resources, the IT costs associated with student services and operation and maintenance of plant will also be applied to this function.

For the FY 2014-15 budget, one of the 15 universities was in the top 20% nationally for this measure and six were above the national median. Of the remaining eight universities, three had improved over the relevant three-year period. (See Attachment 2.)

Pell Grant Students

This data component serves as a measure of access for low-income students. The Pell Grant is a federal financial aid grant awarded based on student financial need. This is a gross measure of low-income student enrollment, with no control for university size, so a smaller university will face a larger challenge in reaching the top-20% or median marks nationally.

For the FY 2014-15 budget, seven of the 15 universities were in the top 20% nationally for this measure and four were above the national median. All four of the remaining had improved over the relevant two-year period. (See Attachment 2.) In fact, all fifteen universities rated as having improved over the three-year period because the number of students eligible for Pell Grants grew substantially across the country due to a combination of federal policy changes and poor economic conditions.

Performance Funding Requirements

In order to qualify for the funding increase allocated to each university for FY 2014-15 (including both the proportional amounts and the performance-based amounts), a university must comply with four policy requirements:

- Comply with tuition restraint requirements under section 265 of the budget, which includes limiting the increase in resident undergraduate tuition and fees for FY 2014-15 to no more than 3.2%.
- Certify that the university participates in reverse transfer agreements with at least three Michigan community colleges (or has made a good faith effort to do so). A reverse transfer agreement allows a student who transfers from a community college to a four-year university and subsequently completes sufficient credits to receive an associate’s degree to be awarded that degree by the community college.
- Certify that the university’s dual enrollment policy does not consider use of dual enrollment courses toward high school graduation requirements as a consideration for awarding college credit for the courses.

- Participate in the Michigan Transfer Network, an online service for students that provides course transfer equivalencies across all public colleges and universities and most independent colleges and universities in the state.

Universities must certify that they have complied with these requirements by August 31, 2014. Any funds forfeited due to noncompliance will be reallocated to compliant universities in proportion to their FY 2014-15 funding increase amounts.¹³

Cumulative University Appropriation Changes

Attachment 3 shows university appropriation amounts over the period of FY 2011-12 to FY 2014-15. Note that changes in university funding increase percentages from year to year reflect both changes in performance as measured by data collected for prior years and modifications in formula methodology implemented in the last two years. Most significantly, the introduction of weighting scored based on enrollment for FY 2013-14 moderated the larger percentage increases that the smaller universities had received for FY 2012-13.

For longer-term analysis of university funding trends, see the 2013 HFA report “State Appropriations, Tuition, and Public University Operating Costs.”¹⁴

Attachments (3)

¹³ For FY 2012-13, a separate funding component was included for tuition restraint, equal to 25.0% of the total funding increase. Universities complying with the tuition restraint requirements (4.0% limit) received funding allocations in proportion to the number of tenths of a percentage point their increases fell below 4.1%. The other three policy items applied as requirements to receive performance funding.

For FY 2013-14, there was no separate funding component for tuition restraint, and tuition restraint became a fourth requirement to receive performance funding. (The percentage allocations for the remaining performance funding components were kept in proportion to those in FY 2012-13 excluding the tuition restraint component.) The tuition restraint limit was 3.75% for that year.

All universities complied with all requirements in both FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14, except that Wayne State’s resident undergraduate tuition/fee increase exceeded the limit in FY 2013-14. The \$534,700 in performance funding initially allocated to Wayne State was, therefore, reallocated to the other 14 universities.

¹⁴ The report is available at:

http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa/PDF/HigherEducation/State_Appropriations_Tuition.and_Public_University_OperatingCosts.pdf

ATTACHMENT 1 FY 2014-15 University Performance Funding Increases

University	FY 2013-14 Year-to-Date Appropriation	Proportional to FY 2010-11		Performance Funding Proportional to Share of Total			Performance Funding Scored vs. National Carnegie Peers*								Total Funding Increase	FY 2014-15 Enacted Appropriation	Percent Change
		50.0%	11.1%	5.6%	33.3%												
		Funding per unit:	\$557 per completion	\$0.0032 per dollar	\$13.63 per weighted point												
	Funding	Critical Skills Undergrad Completions	Funding	Research & Development Expenditures	Funding	6-year Grad Rate	Total Degrees	Institut Support as % of Expends	Pell Grant Students	Total Points	Total Undergrad FYES	FYES- Weighted Points	Funding				
Michigan State	\$249,597,800	\$7,453,666	2,718	\$1,512,787	\$318,951,530	\$1,026,915	2	3	2	3	10	35,494	354,940	\$4,838,050	\$14,831,300	\$264,429,100	5.9%
UM-Ann Arbor	279,232,700	8,309,406	2,743	1,526,631	714,903,000	2,301,744	3	3	2	2	10	27,905	279,050	3,803,622	15,941,400	295,174,100	5.7%
Wayne State	183,398,300	5,627,231	661	367,605	153,453,343	494,067	0	0	0	3	3	15,470	46,410	632,597	7,121,500	190,519,800	3.9%
Michigan Tech	43,473,800	1,259,181	927	515,753	56,380,000	181,524	3	0	2	2	7	5,165	36,155	492,815	2,449,300	45,923,100	5.6%
Western	97,279,000	2,880,074	1,069	594,958	23,042,963	74,190	2	2	2	2	8	17,550	140,400	1,913,738	5,463,000	102,742,000	5.6%
Central	73,540,100	2,105,422	693	385,414	9,894,583	31,857	3	3	3	3	12	18,660	223,920	3,052,167	5,574,900	79,115,000	7.6%
Oakland	45,651,600	1,333,724	1,023	569,356	11,252,501	36,229	0	2	0	2	4	14,182	56,728	773,237	2,712,500	48,364,100	5.9%
Eastern	67,275,400	1,997,545	664	369,553			2	3	2	3	10	15,616	156,160	2,128,556	4,495,700	71,771,100	6.7%
Ferris	45,636,500	1,277,442	1,241	690,720			2	3	2	3	10	10,875	108,750	1,482,329	3,450,500	49,087,000	7.6%
Grand Valley	57,823,500	1,628,394	1,299	722,722			3	3	2	3	11	19,751	217,261	2,961,401	5,312,500	63,136,000	9.2%
Saginaw Valley	25,991,000	728,346	394	219,004			2	2	0	2	6	8,215	49,290	671,853	1,619,200	27,610,200	6.2%
UM-Dearborn	22,510,400	649,667	374	207,873			2	0	0	2	4	5,894	23,576	321,355	1,178,900	23,689,300	5.2%
UM-Flint	19,938,200	549,083	437	242,936			2	2	2	2	8	5,571	44,568	607,489	1,399,500	21,337,700	7.0%
Northern	41,741,400	1,186,036	488	271,425			2	3	2	3	10	7,911	79,110	1,078,318	2,535,800	44,277,200	6.1%
Lake Superior	12,231,000	333,533	173	96,319			0	2	0	2	4	2,231	8,924	121,640	551,500	12,782,500	4.5%
TOTAL:	\$1,265,320,700	\$37,318,750	14,901	\$8,293,056	\$1,287,877,920	\$4,146,528	28	31	21	37	117	210,490	1,825,242	\$24,879,167	\$74,637,500	\$1,339,958,200	5.9%

*Scoring	
Top 20% nationally	3
Above national median	2
Improving over 3 years	2

ATTACHMENT 2
Carnegie-Based Scoring: FY 2014-15 Performance Funding
 Adapted from Business Leaders for Michigan Scorecard

At or Better than the Public Peer
Top 20%

At or Better than the Public Peer
Average or Median

Making Progress

Carnegie Classification	University	2011 6-year Graduation Rate		2008-2011 3-year change (percentage point)		2011 Total Degrees/Certificates		2008-2011 3-year change		2011 Institutional Support as % of Core Expenditures		2008-2011 3-year change (percentage point)		2011 Number of Pell Grant Students		2009-2011 2-year change	
		2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010
Research Univs - Very High	Michigan State	77%		2.0%		10,944		1.3%		6.2%		0.5%		9,250		16.3%	
	UM Ann Arbor	90%		2.0%		11,914		2.5%		6.0%		2.1%		4,436		20.0%	
	Wayne State	26%		(8.0%)		5,576		(1.4%)		8.5%		1.0%		10,274		19.9%	
	<i>Median or Average Top 20%</i>	68%		2.2%		6,986		3.0%		6.6%		0.1%		5,964		19.4%	
		82%				10,234				5.0%				8,860			
Research Univs - High	Michigan Tech	65%		0.0%		1,353		(1.5%)		11.0%		(3.1%)		1,576		6.0%	
	Western	56%		1.0%		5,256		(1.1%)		8.4%		(0.4%)		7,541		12.0%	
	<i>Median or Average Top 20%</i>	52%		2.0%		3,931		3.3%		8.3%		(0.1%)		5,115		20.7%	
		63%				5,653				6.5%				7,699			
Doctoral/Research Univs	Central	54%		(3.0%)		5,724		0.7%		7.8%		(2.5%)		7,420		27.2%	
	Oakland	40%		(4.0%)		3,573		3.2%		13.0%		0.2%		4,711		36.7%	
	<i>Median or Average Top 20%</i>	42%		1.7%		2,474		4.0%		10.7%		0.2%		4,153		20.7%	
		50%				3,668				8.1%				5,465			
Master's Colleges/Univs - larger programs	Eastern	40%		4.0%		4,253		0.1%		10.2%		(2.7%)		8,115		26.5%	
	Ferris State	45%		2.0%		3,305		2.7%		10.0%		(2.9%)		5,599		24.5%	
	Grand Valley	63%		7.0%		5,101		3.3%		9.7%		1.4%		7,403		27.5%	
	Saginaw Valley	39%		1.0%		1,704		1.7%		12.7%		2.0%		3,651		26.7%	
	UM Dearborn	49%		(4.0%)		1,661		(1.3%)		12.9%		0.6%		2,936		16.9%	
	UM Flint	37%		1.0%		1,312		1.9%		12.3%		(0.4%)		3,121		37.5%	
	<i>Median or Average Top 20%</i>	46%		0.9%		1,947		3.3%		10.9%		(0.6%)		3,354		18.0%	
		58%				3,216				8.4%				5,224			
Master's College/Univ - medium prog	Northern	48%		0.0%		1,569		2.0%		9.8%		1.6%		3,477		17.7%	
	<i>Median or Average Top 20%</i>	41%		0.7%		1,025		2.5%		11.1%		(0.4%)		1,950		18.2%	
		55%				1,486				7.4%				2,947			
Bacc Colleges - Diverse Fields	Lake Superior	35%		(3.0%)		569		0.0%		14.6%		1.5%		1,101		13.9%	
	<i>Median or Average Top 20%</i>	38%		(0.3%)		299		4.8%		13.3%		(0.9%)		820		22.0%	
		47%				578				9.8%				1,806			

ATTACHMENT 3 University Appropriation History

University	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	Percent Change	FY 2012-13	Percent Change	*FY 2013-14	Percent Change	FY 2014-15	Percent Change	Cumulative Changes			
										FY 2014-15 vs. FY 2010-11		FY 2014-15 vs. FY 2011-12	
										\$ Change	% Change	\$ Change	% Change
Central	\$80,132,000	\$68,108,900	(15.0)	\$71,352,300	4.8	\$73,540,100	3.1	\$79,115,000	7.6	(\$1,017,000)	(1.3)	\$11,006,100	16.2
Eastern	76,026,200	64,619,100	(15.0)	66,466,700	2.9	67,275,400	1.2	71,771,100	6.7	(4,255,100)	(5.6)	7,152,000	11.1
Ferris	48,619,200	41,324,300	(15.0)	44,250,700	7.1	45,636,500	3.1	49,087,000	7.6	467,800	1.0	7,762,700	18.8
Grand Valley	61,976,400	52,677,400	(15.0)	55,436,000	5.2	57,823,500	4.3	63,136,000	9.2	1,159,600	1.9	10,458,600	19.9
Lake Superior	12,694,200	10,789,500	(15.0)	12,046,100	11.6	12,231,000	1.5	12,782,500	4.5	88,300	0.7	1,993,000	18.5
Michigan State	283,685,200	241,120,800	(15.0)	245,037,000	1.6	249,597,800	1.9	264,429,100	5.9	(19,256,100)	(6.8)	23,308,300	9.7
Michigan Tech	47,924,200	40,733,600	(15.0)	42,579,100	4.5	43,473,800	2.1	45,923,100	5.6	(2,001,100)	(4.2)	5,189,500	12.7
Northern	45,140,300	38,367,400	(15.0)	40,856,600	6.5	41,741,400	2.2	44,277,200	6.1	(863,100)	(1.9)	5,909,800	15.4
Oakland	50,761,300	43,145,000	(15.0)	44,964,100	4.2	45,651,600	1.5	48,364,100	5.9	(2,397,200)	(4.7)	5,219,100	12.1
Saginaw Valley	27,720,700	23,561,500	(15.0)	25,656,700	8.9	25,991,000	1.3	27,610,200	6.2	(110,500)	(0.4)	4,048,700	17.2
UM-Ann Arbor	316,254,500	268,803,300	(15.0)	274,156,700	2.0	279,232,700	1.9	295,174,100	5.7	(21,080,400)	(6.7)	26,370,800	9.8
UM-Dearborn	24,726,200	21,016,300	(15.0)	22,237,300	5.8	22,510,400	1.2	23,689,300	5.2	(1,036,900)	(4.2)	2,673,000	12.7
UM-Flint	20,898,000	17,762,400	(15.0)	19,526,600	9.9	19,938,200	2.1	21,337,700	7.0	439,700	2.1	3,575,300	20.1
Wayne State	214,171,400	182,036,900	(15.0)	183,398,300	0.7	183,398,300	0.0	190,519,800	3.9	(23,651,600)	(11.0)	8,482,900	4.7
Western	109,615,100	93,168,300	(15.0)	95,487,500	2.5	97,279,000	1.9	102,742,000	5.6	(6,873,100)	(6.3)	9,573,700	10.3
TOTAL	\$1,420,344,900	\$1,207,234,700	(15.0)	\$1,243,451,700	3.0	\$1,265,320,700	1.8	\$1,339,958,200	5.9	(\$80,386,700)	(5.7)	\$132,723,500	11.0

*Reflects reallocation of \$534,700 initially appropriated to Wayne State University but forfeited due to noncompliance with tuition restraint requirement.

Note: Amounts reflect only appropriations for university operations; separate appropriations are made for retirement cost reimbursement and certain other purposes.