

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 |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 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% 82% | 2.2% | 6,986 10,234 | 3.0% | 6.6% 5.0% | 0.1% | 5,964 8,860 | 19.4% |
| 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% 63% | 2.0% | 3,931 5,653 | 3.3% | 8.3% 6.5% | (0.1%) | 5,115 7,699 | 20.7% |
| 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% 50% | 1.7% | 2,474 3,668 | 4.0% | 10.7% 8.1% | 0.2% | 4,153 5,465 | 20.7% |
| 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% 58% | 0.9% | 1,947 3,216 | 3.3% | 10.9% 8.4% | (0.6%) | 3,354 5,224 | 18.0% | |
| 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% 55% | 0.7% | 1,025 1,486 | 2.5% | 11.1% 7.4% | (0.4%) | 1,950 2,947 | 18.2% |
| 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% 47% | (0.3%) | 299 578 | 4.8% | 13.3% 9.8% | (0.9%) | 820 1,806 | 22.0% |

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.