

Approved: 2-24-92  
Date

## MINUTES OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson George Teagarden at 1:40 p.m. on February 12, 1992 in room 541-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except: Representatives Dean, Solbach and Adam (All excused).

Committee staff present: Ellen Piekalkiewicz, Legislative Research Department  
Debra Duncan, Legislative Research Department  
Jim Wilson, Revisor of Statutes  
Sue Krische, Administrative Aide  
Rose Baker, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Alan Conroy, Kansas Legislative Research Department

Others attending: See attached list

## REGENTS SYSTEMWIDE ISSUES

Alan Conroy, KLRD, presented a briefing on the Regents Systemwide Issues (Attachment 1). Staff gave an overview of the Governor's FY92 and FY93 budget recommendations regarding Regents' Systemwide Issues. The Board requested an increase of 5% for student salaries and a 5% increase for unclassified salaries. The Governor recommends a 2.5% increase for each. Board requested under the Classified Pay Plan, a 2.5% increase. The Governor recommends step movement of 2.5% and longevity pay. Under Other Operating Expenditures, Board requests a 5% increase. The Governor recommends a 4 percent increase for Other Operating Expenditures. The Board concurred with the Governor for FY93 Enrollment Adjustment and Graduate Teaching Assistant Fee Waiver at 100 percent. The Board is requesting restoration of the 1% State General Fund Lapse in the amount of \$4.0 million; a Salary and Wage Shrinkage Reduction of \$1.2 million; an FY92 General Fee Release of \$1.3 million; a Supplemental FY92 Enrollment Adjustment of \$4.8 million; and Additional 1% Regents Retirement of \$2.5 million. The Governor did not recommend these items. While the Board is requesting Servicing New Buildings, the Governor recommends utility costs only.

In regard to student tuition, the Board recommended that basic fees be fixed at a level so that basic fee income will provide an average of 25 percent of the cost of the general educational program. The increase will be approximately 10% at the three research universities and 8% at the three regional universities. Resident graduate tuition will increase by 10%. Nonresident undergraduate tuition will increase by 12.5%. FY93 tuition increases will become effective in the fall of 1992.

Compared to FY90, salary funding relative to peers in FY91 decreased at all institutions. The FY91 systemwide relative salary funding has increased by 0.2%. The Regents suggest that due to the limited faculty salary increases (3% for 6 months) in FY88, the relative salary funding data is substantially less than originally projected.

FY92 expenditures are estimated by the Agency at \$17.387 million compared to the Governor's recommendation for FY92 of \$17.410 million. The Agency requested expenditures for FY93 are \$17.588 million compared to the Governor's recommendation of \$17.468 million.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m. The next scheduled meeting will be February 13, 1992 in Room 514-S at 1:30 p.m.



**Board of Regents' Institutions  
Systemwide Summary**

<u>Expenditures</u>	<u>Actual FY 91</u>	<u>Agency Est. FY 92</u>	<u>Governor's Rec. FY 92</u>	<u>Agency Req. FY 93</u>	<u>Governor's Rec. FY 93</u>
<b>Operating Expenditures:</b>					
State General Fund	\$ 394,399,649	\$ 398,731,783	\$ 389,063,573	\$ 429,646,283	\$ 401,513,703
General Fees Fund	116,375,224	128,559,327	129,519,359	141,345,845	141,011,285
Hospital Revenue Fund	103,636,611	110,141,996	109,810,000	114,573,923	112,687,146
Fed. Land Grant Funds	6,737,977	6,855,822	6,855,822	7,034,890	7,034,890
Other Funds	1,806,235	4,182,043	6,521,843	1,648,000	2,101,150
Subtotal - General Use	<u>\$ 622,955,696</u>	<u>\$ 648,470,971</u>	<u>\$ 641,770,597</u>	<u>\$ 694,248,941</u>	<u>\$ 664,348,174</u>
Other Funds	289,200,925	295,305,389	295,520,406	516,477,461	304,504,468
Total Operating	<u>\$ 912,156,621</u>	<u>\$ 943,776,360</u>	<u>\$ 937,291,003</u>	<u>\$ 1,210,726,402</u>	<u>\$ 968,852,642</u>
<b>Capital Improvements:</b>					
State General Fund	\$ 1,701,138	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 194,446	\$ 189,050
Hospital Fund	0	1,250,000	0	0	0
Educational Bldg. Fund	16,527,494	22,081,219	21,740,353	6,621,634	6,579,549
Other Funds	15,104,205	23,050,594	23,871,808	37,782,897	36,579,786
Total Capital Impr.	<u>\$ 33,332,837</u>	<u>\$ 46,381,813</u>	<u>\$ 45,612,161</u>	<u>\$ 44,598,977</u>	<u>\$ 43,348,385</u>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<u><u>\$ 945,489,458</u></u>	<u><u>\$ 990,158,173</u></u>	<u><u>\$ 982,903,164</u></u>	<u><u>\$ 1,255,325,379</u></u>	<u><u>\$ 1,012,201,027</u></u>
<b>Percentage Change:</b>					
All Funds	5.6%	3.5%	2.8%	28.3%	3.4%
General Use Funds	4.5	4.1	3.0	7.1	3.5
State General Fund	4.6	1.1	(1.4)	7.8	3.2
<b>FTE Positions:</b>					
Classified	8,045.2	7,986.1	7,999.1	8,064.9	8,001.6
Unclassified	9,392.8	9,400.9	9,410.9	9,523.5	9,466.4
TOTAL	<u>17,438.0</u>	<u>17,387.0</u>	<u>17,410.0</u>	<u>17,588.4</u>	<u>17,468.0</u>

The financing of higher education is of considerable interest to the Kansas Legislature. Traditionally, the Legislature makes many of its decisions regarding financing of higher education on a systemwide basis, applying them to each institution under the jurisdiction of the Kansas Board of Regents. Additionally, the Legislature reviews each of the institutions' individual budgets. This memorandum was prepared to provide information concerning issues of interest to more than one institution. Those requests which are unique to only one campus are discussed as a part of the individual agency analyses.

The introductory table reflects systemwide expenditures for Regents' institutions by financing source and major object of expenditures. The table allows systemwide comparisons between actual fiscal year 1991 expenditures, the agency's revised FY 1992 estimate, the Governor's revised FY 1992 recommendation, the agency's FY 1993 request, and the Governor's FY 1993 current resources and enhanced recommendation. Expenditures for all institutions under the Board's jurisdiction are included. Expenditures for the Board office are not included.

**Financing of University Budgets.** The term "general use fund" is central to discussion of the financing of institutional operating budgets. This term refers to those funds that can be used to provide general financial support for campus operations. General use funds include State General Fund appropriations, General Fees Fund revenues (primarily tuition income), and interest on certain investments. For Kansas State University they also include federal land grant funds and for the University of Kansas Medical Center and Kansas State University Veterinary Medical Center, general use funds include revenues from hospital and laboratory operations.

*H.A.  
2-12-92  
Attachment 1*

In contrast, "restricted use funds" are those that must be used in a manner consistent with the conditions attached to the receipt of the funds. While subject to appropriation by the Legislature, the majority of restricted use funds are treated as "no limit" appropriation accounts, *i.e.*, the institution has the authority to make expenditures from the fund subject to the limitation of available resources. Certain restricted use funds, such as Sponsored Research Overhead Fund, are subject to expenditure limitation and the institutions can not expend resources in excess of the limitation without legislative approval. Other examples of restricted use funds include parking fees, student union fees, federal research grants, and income generated by campus revenue producing activities.

Because the primary legislative concern in the financing of institutional budgets is with general use funds, unless specifically stated otherwise, references to dollar amounts will be only to general use funds.

**Budget Program Structure.** The Budget program structures employed by the universities follow a generally uniform format. The basic programs are:

- Education
  - Instruction
  - Academic Support
  - Student Services
- Institutional Support
- Research
- Public Service
- Utilities
- Scholarships and Fellowships
- Mandatory Transfers

The items given systemwide review for the 1992 Legislature are listed below:

- I. FY 1992 -- Current Year Adjustments
  - A. Employer Health Insurance
- II. FY 1993
  - A. Enrollment
  - B. Student Tuition
  - C. General Fees Expenditures
  - D. FY 1993 Enrollment Adjustment
  - E. FY 1992 Enrollment Adjustment
  - F. Restore One Percent State General Fund Lapse
  - G. Salary and Wage Shrinkage
  - H. Sick Leave at Retirement
  - I. Unclassified Salaries
  - J. Increase Regents Retirement Contribution
  - K. Classified Salary Base Increases
  - L. Student Salaries
  - M. Other Operating Expenditures
  - N. Utilities
  - O. Servicing New Buildings
- III. Mission Related Program Enhancements
- IV. Peer Comparisons

The Board's mission related program enhancement requests are in addition to the systemwide program maintenance requests of 5 percent for unclassified salaries, 5 percent for other operating expenditures, 5 percent for student salaries, and classified pay plan step movement (2.5 percent) and longevity pay. Funding for the servicing of new buildings, salary and wage shrinkage adjustments, and enrollment adjustments, are in addition to the requested program maintenance costs.

## I. FY 1992 – CURRENT YEAR ADJUSTMENTS

### Employer Health Insurance

Employer health insurance costs for employees and dependents have been revised downward from the budgeted amounts by the institutions in FY 1992 and FY 1993. The following table displays the employer health insurance cost for employees and dependents in FY 1992 and FY 1993 as budgeted by the agencies and as recommended by the Governor. The Governor makes the adjustment based on a revised rate.

FY 1992	Budget Instructions	Governor's Rec.	Change	
			\$	%
Single	\$2,338.20	\$2,181.06	\$(156.24)	(6.7)
Dependent	585.24	546.00	(39.24)	(6.7)
<u>FY 1993</u>				
Single	\$2,275.32	\$2,275.32	\$ --	--
Dependent	569.00	569.00	--	--

The adjustments reflected in the following table are mainly attributed to the revised health insurance rates.

	Agency Estimate FY 1992	Governor's Rec. FY 1992	Difference	Agency Request FY 1993	Governor's Rec. FY 1993	Difference
KU	\$ 6,873,589	\$ 6,411,758	\$ (461,831)	\$ 6,829,514	\$ 6,740,379	\$ (89,135)
KSU	4,939,218	4,560,626	(378,592)	4,859,683	4,811,901	(47,782)
WSU	3,480,753	3,219,877	(260,876)	3,425,233	3,383,248	(41,985)
ESU	1,306,144	1,218,498	(87,646)	1,299,578	1,258,450	(41,128)
PSU	1,520,941	1,393,686	(127,255)	1,480,483	1,451,380	(29,103)
FHSU	1,159,907	1,067,309	(92,598)	1,172,965	1,149,834	(23,131)
KUMC	10,499,935	9,795,505	(704,430)	10,242,191	10,214,517	(27,674)
KSUVMC	581,624	542,595	(39,029)	568,158	568,158	--
KSU-Ext.	2,417,256	2,255,045	(162,211)	2,424,486	2,424,486	--
KSU-Salina	223,861	208,840	(15,021)	241,345	241,345	--
Total	<u>\$ 33,003,228</u>	<u>\$ 30,673,739</u>	<u>\$(2,329,489)</u>	<u>\$ 32,543,636</u>	<u>\$ 32,243,698</u>	<u>\$ (299,938)</u>

**II. FY 1993 – PROGRAM MAINTENANCE  
SECTION A**

**Enrollment**

Two computations of enrollment are frequently made and used in discussions of higher education -- headcount and full-time equivalent. Headcount enrollment is simply an unduplicated count of the number of students enrolled at a particular time. Full-time equivalent enrollment is derived from the number of student credit hours in which students are enrolled by dividing by 15 for undergraduate credit hours, 9 for graduate credit hours, and 12 for professional school credit hours. Since some students are enrolled on a part-time basis, full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment is often substantially less than headcount. Headcount and FTE enrollments for the institutions are displayed in the tables which follow. Enrollment in both FTE and headcount for the past five years is displayed in the budget analysis for each institution.

<b>Headcount Enrollments</b>				
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Fall 1990</b>	<b>Fall 1991</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
University of Kansas	26,436	26,661	225	0.9
Kansas State University	20,776	20,352	(424)	(2.0)
Wichita State University	16,668	15,779	(889)	(6.3)
Emporia State University	6,077	6,034	(43)	(0.7)
Fort Hays State University	5,501	5,599	98	1.8
Pittsburg State University	5,918	6,166	248	4.2
University of Kansas Medical Center	2,473	2,489	16	0.6
Kansas State University Vet. Med.	361	360	(1)	(0.3)
Kansas State University - Salina	674	795	121	18.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>84,884</b>	<b>84,235</b>	<b>(649)</b>	<b>(0.8)%</b>

<b>Full-Time Equivalent Enrollments</b>				
<b>Institution</b>	<b>Fall 1990</b>	<b>Fall 1991</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>
University of Kansas	23,855	23,949	94	0.4
Kansas State University	18,278	18,059	(219)	(1.2)
Wichita State University	11,278	10,958	(320)	(2.8)
Emporia State University	5,047	5,088	41	0.8
Fort Hays State University	4,339	4,518	179	4.2
Pittsburg State University	4,912	5,249	337	6.9
University of Kansas Medical Center*	--	--	--	--
Kansas State University Vet. Med.	595	591	(4)	(0.7)
Kansas State University - Salina	393	451	58	14.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>68,697</b>	<b>68,863</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

\* FTE enrollments are not computed for the University of Kansas Medical Center.

The following table displays off-campus full-time equivalent enrollment for Fall, 1991 compared to Fall, 1990. Overall, there was a decline of 210 FTE students or 8.7 percent between the two years.

**Off-Campus Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment Comparisons  
On the 20th Class Day, Fall, 1990 and Fall 1991  
Regents System**

Institution	Fall, 1990 Off-Campus FTE	Fall, 1991 Off-Campus FTE	Off-Campus FTE Change	Off-Campus FTE % Change
University of Kansas	984	1,003	19	1.9
University of Kansas Medical Center	*	*	*	*
Kansas State University	557	416	(141)	(25.3)
Kansas State University Vet. Med.	--	--	--	--
Wichita State University	61	30	(31)	(50.8)
Emporia State University	249	204	(45)	(18.1)
Pittsburg State University	212	243	31	14.6
Fort Hays State University	341	296	(45)	(13.2)
Kansas State University - Salina	5	7	2	40.0
Total	<u>2,409</u>	<u>2,199</u>	<u>(210)</u>	<u>(8.7)</u>

\* Full-time equivalent is not defined.

The following table displays actual FY 1990 academic degrees that were conferred by the Regents institutions.

**FY 1990 Actual Academic Degrees Conferred**

Institution	Bachelor	Master & Specialist	Doctorate	Other	
KU	3,160	990	163	171	J.D.
KSU	2,474	610	155	3	Associate
WSU	1,495	561	11	77	Associate
ESU	605	305	--	5	Associate
PSU	948	312	--	3	Associate
FHSU	628	260	--	34	Associate
KUMC	277	83	15	221	M.D.
KSUVMC	--	--	--	95	DVM
KSU-Salina	--	--	--	98	Associate
Total	<u>9,587</u>	<u>3,121</u>	<u>344</u>	<u>707</u>	

## SECTION B

## Student Tuition

K.S.A. 76-619 grants the Board of Regents authority to set student tuition at the institutions under its control. Although the Legislature has granted this direct authority to the Board, it reviews tuition rates and revenues. Additionally, the Legislature periodically gives general policy recommendations to the Board concerning student tuition. One rather comprehensive set of policy recommendations was issued in 1966 by the Legislative Council. The Council recommended that:

Resident and nonresident basic fees be fixed at a level so that basic fee income will provide on the average, 25 percent of the cost of the general educational program, *i.e.*, excluding the cost of organized research, extension service, auxiliary enterprises, and capital improvements.

The Council also recommended that the 25 percent level be an average based on several (three to four) years, rather than having fees changed annually.

The policy has generally been followed by the Regents and the Legislature since 1966. In recent years tuition increases have been considered more frequently than every three to four years. However, the general policy of systemwide general use expenditures for the education, institutional support, and physical plant (including utilities) programs has been retained.

The Legislature has typically reviewed the percentage actual tuition receipts have represented of total educational costs. For many years systemwide averages were in the range of 20 to 22 percent of the educational costs, with the three larger universities having individual percentages of 23 to 25 percent and the regional universities having percentages of 16 to 18 percent. In 1982 the Board of Regents decided to review tuition rates on an annual basis, a decision which appears to have resulted in more frequent tuition increases and an increase in the ratio of tuition receipts to educational costs. Since FY 1984 the systemwide average has been approximately 24 to 28 percent. In general, the percentages at the three larger schools have exceeded 25 percent, particularly at the University of Kansas. The regional school average has increased from approximately 18 percent in FY 1985 to 20 percent in FY 1986 and over 20 percent since FY 1987. However, Fort Hays State University is below 20 percent in FY 1989 and FY 1990. The table which follows reflects actual fee to educational cost ratios for FY 1987 through FY 1991 and budgeted ratios for FY 1992 and FY 1993. It should be noted that the actual ratio has exceeded 25 percent every year since FY 1987.

## Fee/Cost Ratios

	Actual FY 1987	Actual FY 1988	Actual FY 1989	Actual FY 1990	Actual FY 1991	Approved FY 1992	Gov. Rec. FY 1992	Request FY 1993	Gov. Rec. FY 1993
KU	32.1%	33.7%	33.1%	33.0%	34.9%	36.9%	37.0%	37.9%	39.9%
KSU	25.9	26.7	26.6	27.4	28.8	30.9	31.0	30.9	32.9
WSU	26.2	25.7	25.6	25.7	26.3	27.5	27.4	27.9	29.1
Subtotal	28.8%	29.7%	29.4%	29.6%	31.1%	33.0%	33.0%	33.5%	35.3%
ESU	20.7%	21.1%	20.7%	21.3%	22.1%	23.2%	23.2%	22.6%	24.1%
FHSU	20.0	20.3	19.4	18.9	20.0	21.7	21.8	21.3	22.5
PSU	23.4	23.9	23.1	23.1	23.0	24.7	24.8	24.5	26.0
Subtotal	21.4%	21.8%	21.2%	21.2%	21.8%	23.3%	23.3%	22.9%	24.3%
Overall Avg.	27.2%	28.0%	27.6%	27.8%	29.1%	30.9%	30.9%	31.2%	32.9%

The estimated fee/cost ratio for FY 1993 also may be examined by looking at the residents and non-residents ratios. The following table indicates that resident fee/cost ratios average 22.2 percent systemwide and non-residents average ratio is 63.1 percent.

**Resident and Non-Resident Fee/Cost Ratios – FY 1992 Estimate**

	<u>Resident</u>	<u>Non-Resident</u>
KU, KSU, WSU	23.0%	64.4%
ESU, PSU, FHSU	20.1	52.3
Systemwide	<u>22.2%</u>	<u>63.1%</u>

The Board increased tuition in FY 1989, through FY 1992, and has also announced FY 1993 tuition increases which will become effective in the fall of 1992. The table which follows compares the FY 1992 tuition rates with those that will become effective in FY 1993. As the table indicates, the tuition for resident undergraduates will increase by approximately 10.0 percent at the three research universities and 8.0 percent at the three regional universities. Resident graduate tuition at the institutions will increase by 10.0 percent. Nonresident undergraduate tuition will increase by 12.5 percent at the six universities. Nonresident graduate tuition will increase 12.5 percent at the six institutions. Resident tuition at KSU-Salina, KUMC, and the Veterinary Medical Center will increase by 10.0 percent and nonresident tuition by 12.5 percent.

		Tuition Rates Approved for FY 1992 and FY 1993 (Fulltime, Per Semester)			
		FY 1992 Tuition	FY 1993 Tuition	FY 1993 \$ Increase	FY 1993 % Increase
KU, KSU, WSU	Resident Undergraduate	\$ 662	\$ 728	\$ 66	10.0%
	Resident Graduate	834	917	83	10.0
	Non-Resident Undergrad.	2,501	2,814	313	12.5
	Non-Resident Graduate	2,691	3,027	336	12.5
ESU, PSU, FHSU	Resident Undergraduate	566	611	45	8.0
	Resident Graduate	708	765	57	8.0
	Non-Resident Undergrad.	1,823	2,051	228	12.5
	Non-Resident Graduate	1,981	2,229	248	12.5
KSU-Salina	Resident	481	529	48	10.0
	Non-Resident	1,670	1,879	209	12.5
KUMC*	Resident	3,303	3,633	330	10.0
	Non-Resident	7,266	8,174	908	12.5
KSUVMC	Resident	1,630	1,793	163	10.0
	Non-Resident	5,207	5,858	651	12.5

\* Tuition rates shown are only for medical students. For graduate, allied health, and nursing students, lower tuition rates apply.

The following table reflects anticipated tuition income during FY 1993. The table displays tuition income by academic level and resident and non-resident students.

**Regents' System Estimated FY 1992 Tuition Income  
By Resident and Non-Resident Students**

	<u>Total Tuition Revenue</u>	<u>Resident Tuition Revenue</u>	<u>Nonresident Tuition Revenue</u>	<u>% Revenue from Residents</u>	<u>% Revenue from Non-Res.</u>	<u>Fall 91 % Resident Headcount</u>	<u>Fall 91 % Non-Res. Headcount</u>
KU	\$ 51,000,475	\$ 20,303,847	\$ 30,696,628	39.8	60.2	66.0	34.0
KSU	30,236,096	19,639,867	10,596,229	65.0	35.0	80.5	19.5
WSU	17,439,759	11,967,162	5,472,597	68.6	31.4	89.4	10.6
Subtotal	<u>\$ 98,676,330</u>	<u>\$ 51,910,876</u>	<u>\$ 46,765,454</u>	<u>52.6</u>	<u>47.4</u>	<u>76.6</u>	<u>23.4</u>
ESU	\$ 6,233,147	\$ 5,338,862	\$ 894,285	85.7	14.3	93.9	6.1
PSU	7,231,371	4,975,183	2,256,188	68.8	31.2	84.6	15.4
FHSU	5,632,955	4,472,567	1,160,388	79.4	20.6	91.9	8.1
Subtotal	<u>\$ 19,097,473</u>	<u>\$ 14,786,612</u>	<u>\$ 4,310,861</u>	<u>77.4</u>	<u>22.6</u>	<u>90.0</u>	<u>10.0</u>
Total	<u>\$ 117,773,803</u>	<u>\$ 66,697,488</u>	<u>\$ 51,076,315</u>	<u>56.6</u>	<u>43.4</u>	<u>79.5</u>	<u>20.5</u>

Source: Kansas Board of Regents

Recent legislative discussion has focused on how tuition rates in Kansas compare with a select group of similar public institutions in other states (peer institutions). The following table compares undergraduate resident and non-resident tuition and fees for FY 1991 and FY 1992 for selected public four-year institutions.

**FY 1991 and FY 1992 Undergraduate Tuition and Required Fees Regents Universities and Peers**

**(Fulltime, Per Semester)**

	<u>FY 1991 Resident</u>	<u>FY 1992 Resident</u>	<u>FY 1991 Nonresident</u>	<u>FY 1992 Nonresident</u>
<b>University of Kansas</b>	\$ 782	\$ 831	\$ 2,344	\$ 2,670
<b>Peer Average</b>	877	977	3,165	3,589
University of Colorado	1,128	1,212	4,707	5,176
University of Iowa	940	976	3,110	3,235
Univ. of North Carolina -- Chapel Hill	547	624	2,881	3,558
University of Oklahoma	787	875	2,265	2,471
University of Oregon	983	1,299	2,862	3,504
<b>Kansas State University</b>	786	849	2,348	2,688
<b>Peer Average</b>	866	983	2,873	3,206
Colorado State University	1,111	1,181	3,295	3,533
Iowa State University	940	976	3,080	3,203
North Carolina State University	550	627	2,909	3,561
Oklahoma State University	784	879	2,262	2,475
Oregon State University	939	1,253	2,819	3,258
<b>Wichita State University</b>	804	883	2,366	2,722
<b>Peer Average</b>	1,072	1,213	3,034	3,485
University of Akron	1,216	1,328	2,875	3,247
Portland State University	959	1,269	2,838	3,275
Virginia Commonwealth University	1,360	1,535	3,350	4,140
Univ. of North Carolina -- Greensboro	682	746	3,016	3,680
University of Wisconsin -- Milwaukee	1,078	1,115	3,440	3,549
Western Michigan University	1,138	1,285	2,683	3,020
<b>Emporia State University</b>	691	745	1,752	2,002
<b>Pittsburg State University</b>	679	725	1,740	1,982
<b>Fort Hays State University</b>	728	774	1,789	2,031
<b>Peer Average</b>	670	717	2,344	2,528
University of Northern Arizona	770	795	2,958	3,121
Murray State University	645	705	1,825	2,005
Eastern New Mexico University	615	639	2,124	2,256
Western Carolina University	606	667	2,872	3,194
Central Oklahoma University	580	648	1,459	1,608
Eastern Washington University	806	849	2,825	2,985

Source: *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, as confirmed by the AASCU/NASULGC Survey of Student Charges at Public Institutions, 1991-92, and independent verification by the Kansas Board of Regents as necessary.

The next table, prepared by the Board of Regents, compares Kansas tuition and required fees with peer institutions and national averages. Combined tuition and mandatory fees for Kansas and each of its designated

peer institutions are listed on the following page. The national average for KU and KSU is the average of all public Research I and Research II universities, using the Carnegie Foundation classifications. The national average for WSU, ESU, PSU, and FHSU is the average of all public Comprehensive I and II universities. Kansas resident tuition and fees are more than 16 percent below peers and more than 20 percent below peers among non-residents, when comparisons are made at the larger Kansas institutions. Kansas resident tuition and fees are slightly above the peers, when comparisons are made to Kansas regional institutions. However, non-resident tuition is below the peers by approximately 20 percent at the regional institutions. Nevertheless, the Board notes that a considerable range of tuition exists among the peers and several institutions can be observed having tuition below Kansas institutions.

**Comparisons of Undergraduate Tuition and Required Fees  
Regents' Institutions, Peer Institutions, and National Averages  
(Fulltime, Per Semester)**

	FY 1992 Resident	Increase Over FY 1991	FY 1992 Non-Resident	Increase Over FY 1991
<b>University of Kansas</b>	\$831	6.3%	\$2,670	13.9%
KU Peer Average	\$997	13.7	\$3,589	13.4%
KU as % of Peer Average	83.4%		74.4%	
National Average	\$1,293	12.7	\$3,538	13.7%
KU as % of National Avg.	64.3%		75.5%	
<b>Kansas State University</b>	\$849	8.1%	\$2,688	14.5%
KSU Peer Average	\$983	13.5%	\$3,206	11.6%
KSU as % of Peer Average	86.4%		83.8%	
National Average	\$1,293	12.7%	\$3,538	13.7%
KSU as % of National Avg.	65.7%		76.0%	
<b>Wichita State University</b>	\$883	9.8%	\$2,722	15.0%
WSU Peer Average	\$1,213	13.2%	\$3,485	14.9%
WSU as % of Peer Average	72.8%		78.1%	
National Average	\$928	12.3%	\$2,422	10.4%
WSU as % of National Avg.	95.2%		112.4%	
<b>Emporia State University</b>	\$745	7.8%	\$2,002	14.3%
ESU Peer Average	\$717	7.0	\$2,528	7.9%
ESU as % of Peer Average	103.9%		79.2%	
National Average	\$928	12.3%	\$2,422	10.4%
ESU as % of National Avg.	80.3%		82.7%	

	<u>FY 1992 Resident</u>	<u>Increase Over FY 1991</u>	<u>FY 1992 Non-Resident</u>	<u>Increase Over FY 1991</u>
<b>Pittsburg State University</b>	\$725	6.8%	\$1,982	13.9%
PSU Peer Average	\$717	7.0%	\$2,528	7.9%
PSU as % of Peer Average	101.1%		78.4%	
National Average	\$928	12.3%	\$2,422	10.4%
PSU as % of National Avg.	78.1%		81.8%	
<b>Fort Hays State University</b>	\$774	6.3%	\$2,031	13.5%
FHSU Peer Average	\$717	7.0%	\$2,528	7.9%
FHSU as % of Peer Average	107.9%		80.3%	
National Average	\$928	12.3%	\$2,422	10.4%
FHSU as % of National Avg.	83.4%		83.9%	

Source: Kansas Board of Regents

## SECTION C

### FY 1992 General Fees Expenditures

Tuition receipts are credited to the General Fees Fund of the university where the tuition is collected. Tuition receipts are considered general use moneys and General Fees Fund receipts are budgeted as an offset to amounts appropriated from the State General Fund. An expenditure limitation has traditionally been placed on the General Fees Funds.

To avoid shortfalls in university operating budgets, the Legislature has been relatively consistent in appropriating supplemental funding from the State General Fund when tuition collections have fallen below estimates. Disposition of collections when they exceeded estimates has also been consistent. The Legislature has approved the release of 75 percent of the unanticipated fees in the current year. At issue, however, is whether to release revenues collected which are above projected levels during the fiscal year in which collected or to retain them as an offset to State General Fund appropriations in the subsequent year.

The issue of supplementation of fee shortfalls or release of unanticipated fee collections arises as a result of variances between actual collections and previous estimates. Three components generally comprise the General Fee Fund estimate. First, the number of students must be projected. Second, the average fee collection per student must be estimated. Finally, the Fee Fund balance at the beginning of the fiscal year must be estimated. Obviously, the potential for variance exists in any of the three and those variances can be offsetting. For example, if more students enroll than projected, but they enroll on a part-time basis rather than full-time, the student count can increase while the average fee collection per student decreases. Similarly, shifts in the institutions' mix of resident and nonresident students can impact the average collection per student.

The 1986 interim Special Committee on Financing of Regents' Institutions reviewed the issue of fee release and recommended that 75 percent of the revenues resulting from larger than expected enrollments be released during the fiscal year in which unexpected enrollments occurred. The Committee's recommendation was endorsed by the Governor and the 1987 Legislature and a total of \$1,122,064 was released to three universities for

use during the 1987 fiscal year. It should be noted that fee releases are not permanent additions to the universities' base budgets and that no fee releases were approved between FY 1982 and FY 1986. The following table reviews the fee increases for FY 1987 through FY 1991.

**Fee Releases – FY 1987-91**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>FY 1987</u>	<u>FY 1988</u>	<u>FY 1989</u>	<u>FY 1990</u>	<u>FY 1991</u>
KU	\$ 953,418	\$ 466,382	\$ --	\$ 351,716	\$ 149,500
KSU	93,091	299,112	1,094,478	752,635	308,087
WSU	--	109,096	119,970	90,744	--
ESU	--	125,289	134,127	142,785	36,671
PSU	75,555	--	106,518	249,035	--
FHSU	--	--	--	--	282,450
Total	<u>\$ 1,122,064</u>	<u>\$ 999,879</u>	<u>\$ 1,455,093</u>	<u>\$ 1,586,915</u>	<u>\$ 776,708</u>

Another issue discussed by the interim committee and addressed by the 1987 Legislature is that of the year between the year of enrollment growth and the resulting fee release and the year in which the enrollment adjustment occurs. The method of enrollment adjustment currently used includes a one year interval between the enrollment shift and the application of the enrollment related budgetary adjustment. For example, enrollment adjustments in FY 1991 are based upon enrollment shifts which occurred in FY 1989. If unanticipated fee income, due to increased enrollment, is released in the year it was generated, the financing to be provided in the intervening year requires consideration. Due to the magnitude of the enrollment growth at the University of Kansas during FY 1987, the Governor recommended and the Legislature concurred with the release of approximately \$650,000 for FY 1989 for the University. No formal policy has been adopted concerning the intervening year. The funds approved for the University of Kansas were considered to be one-time and were not to be included in the institution's base for FY 1989.

The Board of Regents has defined increased enrollment for purpose of fee release as the difference between actual fall enrollment and the enrollments of the previous fall. This avoids the double financing which would occur if an institution experienced an enrollment increase having originally projected a decrease.

The Board of Regents has authorized \$1,261,622 in requests for FY 1992 for budget adjustments for revised estimates of tuition revenues to the General Fees Fund. Requested are three institutional increases in the FY 1992 expenditure limitation on the General Fees Fund. An expenditure limitation increase would provide additional resources for FY 1992 over the previously approved level. The requested adjustments were to be based upon actual Fall enrollments, and estimated Spring and Summer enrollments. The Board also requests supplemental State General Fund support for two institutions based on a shortfall in anticipated general fees.

**FY 1992 General Fees Adjustments**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Approved General Fees Fund Expenditure FY 1992</u>	<u>General Fees Fund Requested Adjustment</u>	<u>State General Fund Supplemental Request</u>	<u>Governor's Fee Release/ Supplemental Rec.</u>
KU	\$ 51,686,627	\$ --	\$ 353,639	\$ --
KSU	29,610,773	--	--	--
WSU	17,980,763	--	590,652	590,652
ESU	6,171,627	--	--	--
FHSU	5,432,675	67,620	--	--
PSU	7,067,517	197,383	--	--
KUMC	7,006,058	--	--	--
KSUVMC	3,507,064	--	--	--
KSU-Salina	449,862	52,328	--	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 128,912,966</b>	<b>\$ 317,331</b>	<b>\$ 944,291</b>	<b>\$ 590,652</b>

The Governor does not recommend the release of any fees resulting from larger than expected enrollment during the current fiscal year and instead utilizes the additional tuition to reduce the demand on the State General Fund in the current year. The Governor does recommend supplemental State General Fund financing for Wichita State University in the current year (\$590,652).

**SECTION D**

**FY 1993 Enrollment Adjustment**

**Background.** The enrollment adjustment originated in the 1981 Legislature and has been applied to university budgets in fiscal years 1982 through 1987. The 1981 formula contained several important concepts. It was based upon actual changes in enrollment related to the actual cost of programs generating those enrollment changes. There are 24 academic disciplines (mathematics, agriculture, history, etc.) and four levels of instruction (lower division, upper division, graduate 1, and graduate 2). Credit hour changes are related to the discipline and instructional level in which they occurred for purposes of producing the instructional component of an enrollment adjustment. These procedures were developed to more accurately relate enrollment changes to costs, a feature not present in previous enrollment adjustments. The formula also includes adjustments for student services components which theoretically do not vary by type of student. In addition to the concept of relating enrollment changes to costs, the procedure adopted in 1981 contained two other features, a three-year cycle and a corridor which buffered certain adjustments. These two features were revised by the 1987 Legislature.

The three-year cycle utilized by the 1981 formula compared actual enrollments and expenditures within a three year period. Credit hour changes were computed as a simple difference between a base year and a comparison year. During the first year of the cycle, credit hours generated during the most recent fiscal year were subtracted from those of the base year for a single year comparison. During the second year, data from the most recent year was subtracted from the base year resulting in a two year difference. The same procedure was followed for the third year of the cycle. If the total adjustment exceeded the corridor, the amount by which it exceeded the corridor was subtracted from previous adjustments granted during the cycle to produce the net adjustment. Two three-year cycles elapsed, FY 1982-1984 and FY 1985-1987. The 1987 Legislature adopted the policy that a one year cycle was preferable and that year-to-year comparisons be made.

The 1987 Legislature also adjusted the corridor portion of the enrollment adjustment formula. Previously, the three larger universities had a corridor of plus or minus 1.5 percent and the regionals had a corridor of plus 1.0 and minus 2.0 percent. The concept underlying these corridors is that an institution should not be significantly impacted by relatively minor changes in enrollment. Conversely, larger changes in enrollment should be accompanied by some adjustment to the budget. During the 1987 Session, corridors for all six universities were changed to .5 percent for enrollment increases and 2.5 percent for enrollment decreases. The 2.5 percent decrease would become 1.5 percent if the institution is financed at 100 percent of the peers. Presently, none of the institutions is financed at 100 percent of the peers. The new corridors resulted in the institutions absorbing less of the costs of new students and being able to experience greater enrollment declines without suffering a budget reduction. Actual enrollment adjustments for FY 1982 through FY 1991 have provided an additional \$10,975,634 in appropriations for a net gain of 2,295 students. The following table reflects the actual enrollment adjustments for FY 1982 -- FY 1991.

**Enrollment Adjustments  
FY 1982 -- FY 1991**

	FY 1982	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991
KU	273,431	405,444	(577,476)	—	—	—	—	1,761,362	1,772,467	—
KSU	227,584	1,614,739	560,158	—	(1,460,960)	(288,191)	(342,145)	692,252	96,981	2,508,950
WSU	32,793	99,067	1,172,280	772,201	(120,989)	(269,401)	—	(367,949)	480,423	693,779
ESU	61,601	(61,601)	(34,475)	(157,888)	(1,119,823)	(160,883)	25,790	166,815	386,079	379,615
PSU	—	31,225	187,422	—	—	(527,184)	433,253	937,092	214,779	493,064
FHSU	6,686	148,190	(149,819)	—	(149,557)	(264,656)	—	83,100	—	—
Total Enroll.										
Adjust.	612,095	2,537,073	1,158,090	614,313	(2,851,329)	(1,510,315)	116,898	3,272,672	2,950,729	4,075,408
Total Change in FTE's from Prev. Fall	849	1,371	259	(604)	(1,517)	(972)	(286)	759	1,136	1,300

Source: Kansas Board of Regents.

**Request.** The FY 1993 budget request from the universities include a total enrollment adjustment increase of \$4,880,196 due to actual changes in student credit hour volume when FY 1991 is compared to FY 1990. The request for the six universities is based upon declining enrollment adjustment increases and declining enrollment adjustment decreases as proposed by the Board of Regents which relates the costs of actual enrollment changes to an institutions budgeted expenditures.

The Board of Regents has proposed that beginning with the FY 1992 enrollment adjustment request that the corridors be modified to provide declining percentages of full average cost. A declining percentage approach would also be recommended for enrollment adjustment decreases, as part of the Board's proposal. This would reduce the impact of substantial enrollment declines. The Board suggests that the proposal would eliminate the incentive for uncontrolled growth, particularly that in excess of 3.0 percent. The following table displays the Regents' proposal for modification to the enrollment adjustment process.

### Increase Adjustments as a Percentage of Average Cost

<u>Percentage of Educational Budget</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Regents' Proposed</u>
Less than .5 percent	0%	0%
0.5 to 1.0 percent	100	100
1.1 to 2.0 percent	100	75
2.1 to 3.0 percent	100	50
Over 3.1 percent	100	25

### Decrease Adjustments as a Percentage of Average Cost

<u>Percentage of Educational Budget</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Regents' Proposed</u>
Less than 2.5 percent	0%	0%
2.5 to 3.0 percent	100	100
3.1 to 4.0 percent	100	75
4.1 to 5.0 percent	100	50
More than 5.0 percent	100	25

The following table indicates the FY 1993 enrollment adjustment request for each of the institutions and compares them to gross adjustments which would occur in the absence of corridors. For FY 1993 the institutions request a net enrollment adjustment of \$3,107,995. The Governor in FY 1993 recommends \$3,100,790 for the requested FY 1993 enrollment adjustment.

### FY 1993 Enrollment Adjustment Requests

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Gross Adjustment Without Corridor</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustment Increase Corridor</u>	<u>Proposed Adjustment Decrease Corridor</u>	<u>Requested Enrollment Adjustment</u>	<u>Gov. Rec. FY 93</u>
KU	\$ 1,803,089	\$ 776,737	\$ -	\$ 1,026,352	\$ 1,019,147
KSU	2,479,037	1,012,551	(1,507,386)	1,466,486	1,466,486
WSU	(505,330)	-	-	-	-
ESU	295,592	140,496	-	155,096	155,096
FHSU	846,421	386,360	-	460,061	460,061
PSU	(587,251)	-	(705,823)	-	-
Total	<u>\$ 4,331,558</u>	<u>\$ 2,316,144</u>	<u>\$ (2,213,209)</u>	<u>\$ 3,107,995</u>	<u>\$ 3,100,790</u>

The following table displays for each of the budgeted academic areas the FY 1992 cost data by educational level that are used in calculating the requested enrollment adjustment data.

## ENROLLMENT ADJUSTMENT

## FY 1992 Funding Rates by Academic Discipline and Educational Level

Academic Discipline by Educational Level	KU	KSU	WSU	ESU	PSU	FHSU
<u>Agriculture</u>						
Lower Division	\$ -	\$ 70.02	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 115.17
Upper Division	-	107.83	-	-	-	184.28
Graduate One	-	403.30	-	-	-	230.35
Graduate Two	-	882.21	-	-	-	-
<u>Architecture</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 118.77	\$ 97.59	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Upper Division	148.46	111.25	-	-	-	-
Graduate One	438.25	428.42	-	-	-	-
Graduate Two	-	856.84	-	-	-	-
<u>Biological Science</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 80.56	\$ 73.91	\$ 78.69	\$ 68.09	\$ 36.18	\$ 95.68
Upper Division	181.26	108.64	251.04	138.17	166.08	153.09
Graduate One	381.86	362.14	553.22	268.06	240.62	325.32
Graduate Two	892.61	684.37	715.34	-	-	-
<u>Business</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 92.40	\$ 38.93	\$ 41.86	\$ 60.18	\$ 79.73	\$ 54.89
Upper Division	108.11	81.36	79.95	78.32	63.78	76.84
Graduate One	259.65	182.58	218.09	104.10	175.40	296.39
Graduate Two	377.93	365.16	318.55	-	-	-
<u>Communications</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 54.67	\$ 75.83	\$ 37.08	\$ -	\$ 96.95	\$ 59.44
Upper Division	84.74	155.46	93.82	-	179.36	59.44
Graduate One	173.31	380.95	86.40	-	214.27	59.44
Graduate Two	-	765.90	-	-	-	-
<u>Computer Science</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 65.67	\$ 74.53	\$ 84.62	\$ -	\$ 101.78	\$ 49.04
Upper Division	191.09	158.00	181.93	-	128.24	142.21
Graduate One	508.27	237.74	269.94	-	-	264.80
Graduate Two	1,613.47	1,380.23	-	-	-	-
<u>Education</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 66.04	\$ 57.52	\$ 93.63	\$ 66.90	\$ 87.79	\$ 92.19
Upper Division	80.57	65.57	106.73	100.35	79.89	110.63
Graduate One	87.83	128.27	95.50	117.07	113.25	92.19
Graduate Two	290.57	408.97	296.79	-	-	-
<u>Engineering</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 109.50	\$ 88.66	\$ 168.13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Upper Division	185.06	196.83	152.99	-	-	-
Graduate One	366.84	508.92	275.73	-	-	-
Graduate Two	721.63	856.48	865.85	-	-	-

Academic Discipline by Educational Level	KU	KSU	WSU	ESU	PSU	FHSU
<u>Fine Arts</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 119.24	\$ 70.97	\$ 117.64	\$ 110.80	\$ 133.77	\$ 152.30
Upper Division	180.06	188.77	195.28	188.37	276.90	167.53
Graduate One	292.14	403.10	345.86	265.93	258.17	335.05
Graduate Two	536.59	806.19	-	-	-	-
<u>Foreign Language</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 48.62	\$ 59.35	\$ 80.23	\$ 92.09	\$ 68.82	\$ 88.98
Upper Division	184.28	114.55	129.98	141.82	167.92	266.95
Graduate One	261.59	137.10	113.93	255.10	172.73	355.94
Graduate Two	582.98	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Health Science</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 108.46	\$ -	\$ 182.15	\$ -	\$ 196.44	\$ 222.47
Upper Division	96.53	-	169.40	-	206.27	222.47
Graduate One	164.85	-	244.08	-	587.37	133.48
Graduate Two	630.13	-	1,010.92	-	-	-
<u>Home Economics</u>						
Lower Division	\$ -	\$ 54.58	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 103.10	\$ 134.33
Upper Division	-	105.89	-	-	115.48	201.49
Graduate One	-	266.35	-	-	-	-
Graduate Two	-	413.18	-	-	-	-
<u>Law</u>						
Lower Division	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Upper Division	-	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate One	150.92	-	-	-	-	-
Graduate Two	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Letters</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 52.63	\$ 39.67	\$ 52.30	\$ 68.73	\$ 67.65	\$ 73.31
Upper Division	113.67	158.30	110.35	164.95	102.16	124.63
Graduate One	204.19	263.44	197.17	206.19	169.81	109.97
Graduate Two	661.52	1,384.62	637.02	-	-	-
<u>Library Science</u>						
Lower Division	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57.65	\$ -	\$ -
Upper Division	-	-	-	57.65	-	-
Graduate One	-	-	-	191.40	-	-
Graduate Two	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Mathematics</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 47.90	\$ 43.15	\$ 51.28	\$ 46.32	\$ 58.51	\$ 82.60
Upper Division	212.20	91.90	101.01	110.70	125.00	123.90
Graduate One	691.21	269.67	244.59	234.37	174.95	363.44
Graduate Two	758.75	854.73	772.22	-	-	-

Academic Discipline by Educational Level	KU	KSU	WSU	ESU	PSU	FHSU
<u>Military Science</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 56.35	\$ 59.59	\$ 68.38	\$ 32.44	\$ 13.05	\$ --
Upper Division	--	58.99	68.38	33.09	27.40	--
Graduate One	--	208.56	--	--	--	--
Graduate Two	--	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Physical Sciences</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 84.38	\$ 79.51	\$ 76.61	\$ 104.61	\$ 90.69	\$ 116.87
Upper Division	215.17	153.46	142.49	208.17	159.62	151.93
Graduate One	545.93	646.45	326.34	289.76	510.61	280.48
Graduate Two	1,189.74	958.15	696.35	--	--	--
<u>Psychology</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 42.12	\$ 30.33	\$ 42.48		\$ 23.22	\$ 50.99
Upper Division	91.40	40.33	79.45	See	112.83	101.98
Graduate One	184.49	261.11	266.38	Education	81.26	178.47
Graduate Two	358.02	637.46	604.56		--	--
<u>Public Affairs</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 107.03	\$ --	\$ 64.70	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --
Upper Division	140.21	--	60.17	--	--	--
Graduate One	108.10	--	119.70	--	--	--
Graduate Two	154.12	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Social Sciences</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 43.91	\$ 44.15	\$ 49.63	\$ 44.40	\$ 55.59	\$ 52.74
Upper Division	133.06	78.15	114.65	130.98	116.74	89.65
Graduate One	345.60	191.18	254.61	178.93	202.36	147.66
Graduate Two	728.96	516.15	480.93	--	--	--
<u>Interdisciplinary Studies</u>						
Lower Division	\$ 21.99	\$ --	\$ 49.19	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --
Upper Division	27.93	--	49.19	--	--	--
Graduate One	--	--	--	--	--	--
Graduate Two	--	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Technology</u>						
Lower Division	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ --	\$ 122.55	\$ --
Upper Division	--	--	--	--	128.68	--
Graduate One	--	--	--	--	178.92	--
Graduate Two	--	--	--	--	--	--

## SECTION E

## FY 1992 Supplemental Enrollment Adjustment

The Board of Regents request State General Fund supplemental appropriation to fund the FY 1992 enrollment adjustment which was not funded by the 1991 Legislature. The following table indicates the FY 1992 supplemental enrollment adjustment request for each of the institutions and compares them to gross adjustments which would occur in the absence of corridors. During FY 1992, the institutions request a net enrollment adjustment of \$4,880,196. Kansas State University-Salina requests an enrollment adjustment of \$108,525 in FY 1992.

## FY 1992 Supplemental Enrollment Adjustment Requests

Institution	Gross Adjustment Without Corridor	Proposed Adjustment Increase Corridor	Proposed Adjustment Decrease Corridor	FY 1992 Requested Enrollment Adjustment	Gov. Rec. FY 1992
KU	\$ 2,125,730	\$ 853,573	\$ --	\$ 1,272,157	\$ --
KSU	4,063,113	2,144,047	--	1,919,066	--
WSU	698,499	321,347	--	377,152	--
ESU	1,502,246	870,896	--	631,530	--
FHSU	251,593	124,259	--	127,334	--
PSU	618,654	241,516	--	377,138	--
Total	<u>\$ 9,259,835 *</u>	<u>\$ 4,555,638</u>	<u>\$ --</u>	<u>\$ 4,704,377 *</u>	<u>\$ --</u>

\* Excludes the request of the Kansas State University-Salina.

## SECTION F

## Restoration of FY 1992 One Percent State General Fund Lapse in FY 1993

For FY 1993 the Regents request the restoration of \$3,975,530 for the FY 1992 one percent State General Fund lapse. The 1 percent recision was approved by the State Finance Council against all State General Fund appropriations in FY 1992 to increase the State General Fund balance. The following table reflects the amount requested for the restoration by each agency in FY 1993.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>FY 1993 Amount Req.</u>	<u>Gov. Rec. FY 1993</u>
KU	\$ 1,011,000	\$ --
KSU	721,839	--
WSU	479,862	--
ESU	210,651	--
FHSU	208,471	--
PSU	226,373	--
KUMC	659,740	--
KSU-Extension	332,470	--
KSU-Vet. Med.	82,526	--
KSU-Salina	40,598	--
Total	<u>\$ 3,973,530</u>	<u>\$ --</u>

## SECTION G

### Salary And Wage Shrinkage

The shrinkage of salary and wage resources reflects moneys not spent because of employee terminations, delayed recruitment, and other factors affecting payrolls. It is generally expressed as a percentage of total salaries and wages. For budget purposes, shrinkage is deducted from the amount of funds needed to fully finance all positions for the full year to yield "net salaries and wages" for the budget document. The Regents have traditionally budgeted salary and wage shrinkage as a fixed percentage from year to year that may or may not reflect the actual shrinkage rate. In addition, in a manner generally unique to Regents' institutions, the shrinkage rate is applied only to salaries and not to salaries and fringe benefits, as with other state agencies' shrinkage calculations. The following table reflects the shrinkage rates that have traditionally been applied by the Regents' institutions prior to FY 1991.

### Previous Regents' Shrinkage Rates

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Unclassified Positions</u>	<u>Classified Positions</u>
KU, KUMC, KSU	2.0%	5.0%
WSU	1.5	4.0
ESU, PSU, FHSU	1.0	2.0
KUMC-Nursing	--	3.0

Finally, the Regents have not budgeted salary and wage shrinkage for student salaries.

Governor Hayden for FY 1990 and FY 1991 recommended using the actual shrinkage rate for FY 1989 for each institution on the overall salary base including fringe benefits. The 1990 Legislature approved a shrinkage rate in FY 1991 of one-half of the increased shrinkage recommended by Governor Hayden. However,

the Legislature specifically did not apply the shrinkage rate against student salaries. For FY 1993, the institutions propose that the salary and wage shrinkage rate be computed at the FY 1991 rate minus .25 percent. However, no institution's rate would be less than the rate prior to FY 1991.

The following table displays the salary and wage shrinkage rate prior to FY 1991, the FY 1992 rate, the requested FY 1993 rate including an estimated fiscal impact, plus the Governor's FY 1993 rate. The Governor recommends usage of the FY 1991 rate in FY 1993 and does not concur with the requested adjustment.

#### FY 1993 Shrinkage Percentages

Institution	Previous Policy %	FY 1992 %	FY 1993 Request	Estimated Fiscal Impact	
KU	2.19%	2.29%	2.19%	\$ 308,596	2.29%
KSU	2.19	2.67	2.42	220,665	2.67
WSU	1.66	2.81	2.56	142,054	2.81
ESU	.98	1.33	1.08	59,079	1.33
PSU	1.02	1.41	1.16	59,344	1.41
FHSU*	.97	2.18	1.93	20,079	2.18
KUMC	2.72	3.31	3.01	218,306	3.23
KSU-Ext.	2.19	2.67	2.22	91,910	2.67
KSUVMC	2.47	2.47	2.47	25,538	2.47
KSU-Salina	--	1.00	.75	6,294	1.00
Total	<u>2.10%</u>	<u>2.58%</u>	<u>2.38%</u>	<u>\$ 1,151,865</u>	<u>2.58%</u>

#### SECTION H

##### Sick Leave at Retirement

The Regents request \$993,968 in FY 1993 as part of the state-government wide plan to establish a payment of sick leave at retirement account. All state agencies would contribute 0.23 percent of their gross salary costs to the account. If approved, agencies would request reimbursement from this fund for the cost of accrued sick leave to employees who retire from state service. The Governor in FY 1993 recommends \$1,038,450 for the establishment of a sick leave at retirement account.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Request FY 1993</u>	<u>Gov. Rec. FY 1993</u>
KU	\$ 244,805	\$ 252,042
KSU	146,161	168,360
WSU	107,773	108,455
ESU	42,441	45,314
FHSU	41,042	44,638
PSU	47,475	49,596
KUMC	274,408	274,408
KSU-Extension	64,618	70,445
KSU-Vet. Med.	18,554	19,683
KSU-Salina	6,691	6,509
Total	<u>\$ 993,968</u>	<u>\$ 1,039,450</u>

## SECTION I

## Unclassified Salary Increases

**Request.** The Regent's institutions FY 1993 request is \$17,227,525 systemwide to provide an average 5 percent salary increase to unclassified faculty and staff. This request is computed as a percentage increase to the overall salary base; however, actual salary increases are granted based upon individual merit. The Governor's budget includes a 2.5 percent increase in unclassified salaries.

**FY 1993 Unclassified Salary Increases  
(Including Fringe Benefits)**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>FY 1993 Request</u>	<u>Gov. Rec. FY 1993</u>
KU	\$ 4,841,574	\$ 2,351,517
KSU	3,356,830	1,200,092
WSU	1,960,213	987,044
ESU	695,755	491,580
FHSU	666,079	299,635
PSU	745,003	527,284
KUMC	2,636,886	1,878,380
KSU-Ext.	1,422,304	680,529
KSUVMC	346,179	152,619
KSU-Salina	151,675	50,854
Total	<u>\$ 16,822,498</u>	<u>\$ 8,619,534</u>

**Institutional Salary Policies.** Institutions may distribute salary increases in varying percentages rather than on a uniform percentage basis. This procedure permits the use of merit as a criterion for determining

unclassified salary increases and provides flexibility for the recruiting and retention of unclassified personnel. The following table displays the distribution of unclassified salary increases for FY 1992.

**Summary of Budgeted Salary Increases for Full-Time  
Continuing Unclassified Persons FY 1992 Over FY 1991**

% of Salary Increase Over Previous Year	KU	KUMC	KSU	WSU	ESU	PSU	FHSU	KSU VMC	KSU- Salina	System Total
No Increase	20	106	53	9	3	21	4	1	3	220
.1 to 2.9	1,243	836	1,028	20	72	559	219	255	199	4,431
3.0 to 4.9	177	193	142	13	7	112	44	36	33	757
5.0 to 6.9	26	46	28	6	2	15	11	5	11	150
7.0 to 8.9	25	8	43	0	2	7	4	1	3	93
9.0 to 11.9	13	11	18	2	0	0	1	0	2	47
12.0 to 14.9	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	11
15.0 to 19.97	3	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	9
20.0 and Over	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Total	<u>1,510</u>	<u>1,200</u>	<u>1,326</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>715</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>5,721</u>
Avg. \$ Incr.	1,086	935	1,167	865	1,480	954	1,008	1,062	1,024	1,053
Avg. % Incr.	2.57	2.47	2.70	2.86	2.50	2.50	2.71	2.70	2.69	2.59

Source: Kansas Board of Regents

The FY 1992 base budgets, originally approved by the 1991 Legislature, contained financing for a 2.5 percent overall unclassified salary base increase subject to the 1 percent State General Fund recision. The 1 percent reduction results in a range of increases (2.47 to 2.86 percent) because the reduction was across-the-board, rather than explicit legislative policy with regard to average salary increases. It should also be noted that the unclassified salary increases include salary adjustments made due to promotions.

**FY 1991 and FY 1992 Budgeted Academic Year Average Faculty Salaries**

Institution	FY 1991 Number	FY 1992 Number	FY 1991 Avg. Salary	FY 1992 Avg. Salary
KU	958	956	\$ 45,561	\$ 46,540
KSU	1,043	1,090	40,626	41,177
WSU	529	521	36,976	38,234
ESU	217	240	34,604	34,930
FHSU	201	205	35,662	36,060
PSU	239	245	36,754	37,191
KSUVMC	77	82	47,666	49,835
KSU-Salina	43	37	32,032	33,769
Total	<u>3,307</u>	<u>3,376</u>	<u>\$ 40,543*</u>	<u>\$ 41,326*</u>

\* The total average salary shown is weighted to reflect the number of faculty positions at each institution.

**Average Salaries.** The budgeted average salary in FY 1991 was \$40,543, while the average in FY 1992 is \$41,326 or an increase of \$783. As previously noted, the average unclassified salary increase tends to be larger than the base increase, due in part to changes in faculty numbers and salaries. Average salaries (including 12 month converted to nine month) shown below include all faculty of the universities budgeted for FY 1991, including funds budgeted for vacant positions. This differs from the above table, which contained data for filled positions only.

The table below displays the average faculty salary by rank for each institution. As one would expect, the average faculty salary at each rank is higher at the larger institutions than at the smaller ones. Another factor that impacts the average is the number of faculty at each rank. Thus, while the average salaries at the two highest ranks for WSU are relatively close to those at KU, the heavy distribution of faculty in the lower paid ranks results in a significantly lower overall average.

**1992 Budgeted Academic Year Average  
Faculty Salaries by Rank**

	<u>KU</u>	<u>KSU</u>	<u>WSU</u>	<u>ESU</u>	<u>PSU</u>	<u>FHSU</u>	<u>KSUVMC</u>	<u>KSU-Sal.</u>	<u>System</u>
Professors	491	424	113	67	98	74	37	13	1,317
Avg. Salary	\$54,423	\$49,559	\$52,796	\$41,525	\$42,758	\$42,606	\$58,373	\$37,538	\$50,473
Associate Prof.	282	337	153	72	60	53	16	10	983
Avg. Salary	\$40,571	\$38,819	\$38,307	\$36,948	\$37,750	\$36,247	\$47,069	\$33,777	\$38,984
Assistant Prof.	178	270	213	74	82	55	27	5	904
Avg. Salary	\$34,828	\$33,813	\$33,449	\$30,724	\$30,545	\$31,272	\$41,407	\$32,823	\$33,444
Instructors	5	59	42	27	5	23	2	9	172
Avg. Salary	\$26,039	\$28,103	\$23,059	\$24,712	\$30,355	\$26,018	\$27,815	\$28,840	\$26,101
Total Institution	956	1,090	521	240	245	205	82	37	3,376
Avg. Salary	\$46,540	\$41,177	\$38,234	\$34,930	\$37,191	\$36,060	\$49,835	\$33,769	\$41,326

Note: Summary based on combined 9 and 12-month appointments, with 12-month salaries converted to 9-month salaries.

Source: Kansas Board of Regents.

**Previous Increases.** The following table enumerates base budget salary increases approved by the Legislature for FY 1974 through FY 1992 and compares inflation during those years.

**Percent Increases Authorized for  
Unclassified Salary Adjustments**

Fiscal Year	KU	KSU	WSU	ESU	FHSU	PSU	CPI-U
1974	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	5.5%	8.9%
1975	10.0	11.0	10.0	11.0	11.0	11.0	11.1
1976	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.1
1977	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	9.0	8.0	5.8
1978	6.0	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	6.0	6.7
1979	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	9.4
1980	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	13.3
1981	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	11.6
1982	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	9.0	7.0	8.6
1983	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	10.2	7.5	4.3
1984	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	3.7
1985	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	3.9
1986	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	2.9
1987	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.2
1988	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	4.1
1989	7.3	7.4	7.4	7.2	9.2	8.1	4.6
1990	7.5	7.7	8.7	7.5	10.5	8.3	4.8
1991	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.8	2.3	2.4	4.3*
1992	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	NA

\* Estimated calendar year rate.

The percentages listed above for FY 1983 exclude allocation of a \$900,000 special appropriation for salary enrichment, which equated systemwide to an approximate of 0.7 percent base increase. Further, the authorized increase for FY 1984 and FY 1989 is the annualized percent increase rather than the increase in expenditures, 2.25 and 1.5 percent, respectively. Finally, a measure of inflation, the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (U.S. City Average) (CPI-U), is indicated. The percentages displayed for this measure represent the percent change in the 12-month average index from one fiscal year to the next.

During most of these 17 years, the same percentage of unclassified increase has been authorized for the six universities. A major exception to this has been at Fort Hays State University where a differential adjustment was authorized for five years to finance salary upgrades. The percentages of increase authorized from FY 1973 through FY 1982 were generally below inflation, but have been near the inflation rate in the most recent years. However, the cumulative increase over the 15-year period has kept pace with inflation. Nonetheless, these comparisons measure only the increases on the base and do not speak to the appropriateness of the base of funding to which the adjustment is made.

As has been previously discussed, the institutions have considerable flexibility in allocation of salary increases. Typically, the actual average increase exceeds the percentages appropriated due, in part, to the fact that the universities may have savings from personnel turnover that can be used to supplement appropriated increases to the salary base. The following table reflects the degree to which this has actually occurred between FY 1974 and FY 1991. It lists average actual percent increases in those years and compares the increase to the inflation indicator.

**Average Percent Increase for Full-Time  
Continuing Unclassified Staff**

Fiscal Year	KU	KSU	WSU	ESU	FHSU	PSU	CPI-U
1974	6.4%	6.4%	6.4%	6.0%	5.6%	5.9%	8.9%
1975	10.5	11.2	10.3	11.4	10.9	11.3	11.1
1976	10.5	10.2	9.1	10.4	11.0	10.0	7.1
1977	8.5	8.2	7.9	8.0	10.4	8.3	5.8
1978	6.4	6.3	6.0	6.0	7.7	6.1	6.7
1979	7.4	7.4	7.3	7.1	8.0	7.3	9.4
1980	6.9	6.8	6.7	6.5	6.7	6.9	13.3
1981	9.6	9.5	9.5	10.2	8.8	9.0	11.6
1982	8.0	7.7	7.6	7.8	9.0	7.5	8.6
1983	8.9	9.1	8.5	8.7	10.8	8.3	4.3
1984	4.6	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.1	4.5	3.7
1985	7.5	7.2	8.5	7.2	7.2	7.9	3.9
1986	5.6	5.3	5.3	5.1	5.4	5.9	2.9
1987	3.3	2.8	2.9	2.5	3.2	3.1	2.2
1988	1.6	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.6	2.5	4.1
1989	8.7	8.1	7.7	7.6	9.4	9.1	4.6
1990	8.4	9.6	8.2	8.1	10.2	9.0	4.8
1991	3.0	3.3	2.8	2.9	2.3	3.6	4.3*
1992	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.5	2.7	2.5	NA

\* Estimated calendar year rate.

The table reflects the fact that often the actual salary increases have exceeded the base increases appropriated. In contrast to the appropriated increases, the table also indicates that actual salaries have federally exceeded the inflationary measure, although the margin by which the increases have exceeded the CPI-U is relatively narrow at some of the universities.

### Faculty Attrition

Each year, the institutions submit reports concerning faculty resignations, retirements, and terminations to the Board of Regents. FY 1991 data have now been compiled by the Board, reflecting departure among those persons having a faculty appointment. Administrators and other support personnel are excluded from the computations unless they have a faculty appointment. During FY 1991, there were 143 resignations, 71 retirements, and 49 terminations.

Resignations, retirements, and terminations, during each of the past three years, are shown in the following table. Total resignations were lower in FY 1991 than during either of the preceding two years, largely the result of a decline which occurred at KUMC. KSU also recorded a reduction in FY 1990 resignations, compared to the previous two years. Resignations declined at KU and FHSU when FY 1989 is compared to FY 1988; however, during FY 1990, resignations increased significantly. Resignations at WSU and ESU were roughly the same in each of the years. At FHSU, resignations increased during FY 1991, compared to the previous years. Retirements also declined slightly when FY 1991 is compared to previous years; however, there was a slight increase in terminations in FY 1991.

**Faculty Resignations, Retirements, and Terminations  
by Institution  
FY 1989-FY 1991**

Institution	Resignations			Retirements			Terminations		
	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991
KU	19	29	15	16	17	21	5	5	12
KUMC	41	17	28	7	4	4	5	-	2
KSU	49	27	21	33	25	16	12	4	11
WSU	38	42	30	9	11	9	19	28	11
ESU	12	14	12	7	8	11	10	7	6
PSU	7	13	4	11	5	4	-	1	1
FHSU	1	11	32	4	5	5	6	-	-
KSU-Sal.	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	-	6
Total	167	155	143	87	75	71	57	45	49

Source: Kansas Board of Regents, January, 1992.

Resignations at each of the professorial levels are detailed in the following table. Of FY 1991 resignations, 9.1 percent were professors, 16 percent were associate professors, 53.1 percent were assistant professors, and 21.7 percent were instructors. The FY 1991 distribution of resignations among the professorial levels generally is typical of that which has occurred during recent years.

**Faculty Resignations  
Kansas Regents' Institutions  
FY 1991**

Institution	Total All Ranks	Full Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Asst. Prof.	Instr.
KU	15	1	4	10	0
KUMC	28	2	3	19	4
KSU	21	6	2	12	1
WSU	30	2	7	17	4
ESU	12	1	2	3	6
PSU	4	0	0	4	0
FHSU	32	1	4	11	16
KSU-Salina	1	0	1	0	0
Total	143	13	23	76	31

Source: Kansas Board of Regents, January, 1992.

## SECTION J

## Increase of Regents Retirement Contribution

The Regents requests \$2,211,481 to be added to the general use base budget to fund an increase in the Regents retirement system from 8 percent to 9 percent. Regents basic retirement plan providers are TIAA-CREF, AETNA, Lincoln National, and UNUM. Any company certified by the Board of Regents may be utilized for voluntary annuities are sheltered from state and federal taxes. For basic, the employee contributes 5 percent of gross compensation and the Regents contribute 8 percent of gross compensation. Voluntary contributions may be made up to the maximum allowed by the IRS. Faculty and administrative personnel holding positions 50 percent time or more are eligible; however, there is a one year waiting period unless the employee was a prior participant at a higher education institution at least one year. The Governor does not recommend the requested one percent additional the Regents retirement system. The next table reflects the requested amount by institution for the increased retirement contribution and the Governor's FY 1993 recommendation.

Institution	Request FY 1993	Gov. Rec. FY 1993
KU	\$ 815,944	\$ --
KSU	265,810	--
WSU	293,043	--
ESU	111,879	--
FHSU	132,614	--
PSU	155,923	--
KUMC	393,557	--
KSU-Extension	68,817	--
KSU-Vet. Med.	20,996	--
KSU-Salina	52,898	--
Total	<u>\$ 2,311,481</u>	<u>\$ --</u>

## SECTION K

## Classified Salary Base Increases

The Regents are requesting \$3.2 million for financing in FY 1993 for pay plan step movement and longevity pay for classified employees. The following table displays for each institution the approved FY 1992 classified base amount, adjustments to that base for employee fringe benefit rate changes, shift and full-year funding of staffing approved by the 1991 Legislature, classified step movement for FY 1992, including longevity pay, and the total requested FY 1992 base amount (excluding enrollment adjustment and servicing new buildings). The Governor's FY 1993 budget provides for step movement and longevity pay.

**Classified Salary Increases Regents' Request**

(Including fringe benefits)

<u>Institution</u>	<u>FY 1993 Agency Req.</u>	<u>FY 1993 Gov. Rec.</u>
KU	\$ 691,851	\$ 582,465
KSU	481,374	509,947
WSU	280,433	262,129
ESU	120,668	151,572
FHSU	118,751	152,557
PSU	147,348	180,231
KUMC	1,029,632	936,656
KSU-Ext.	152,738	161,951
KSUVMC	72,117	73,550
KSU-Salina	23,500	29,625
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,118,412</b>	<b>\$ 3,040,683</b>

**SECTION L**

**Student Salary Base Increases**

**Request.** The Regents are requesting a 5 percent increase in the student salary base during FY 1993. The request for increasing the student salary base totals \$436,684. The table below identifies the student salary base and requests for increase by institution.

The Governor's budget provides a 2.5 percent student salary base increase for FY 1993.

**Student Salary Increase**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>FY 1992 Base</u>	<u>FY 1993 5% Incr.</u>	<u>Gov. Rec. FY 1993</u>
KU	\$ 1,745,108	\$ 90,145	\$ 43,771
KSU	1,393,306	70,533	36,828
WSU	1,213,036	63,486	34,377
ESU	841,988	42,900	24,208
FHSU	945,448	47,338	26,589
PSU	734,995	36,873	10,480
KUMC	1,274,776	63,972	31,986
KSU-Ext.	285,810	13,818	6,903
KSUVMC	112,320	5,638	3,068
KSU-Salina	45,141	1,981	951
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,591,928</b>	<b>\$ 436,684</b>	<b>\$ 219,161</b>

Student salaries serve two purposes, providing students with a source of income and providing the institution with a source of relatively low-cost labor. General Use support salaries typically represent less than one-half of the total institutional expenditures for student salaries. This is because of the federal College Work Study Program, the availability of funding from restricted use sources such as research grants, and the large number of students employed in auxiliary enterprises such as student unions and dormitories. The current minimum wage rate is \$4.25 per hour.

The following tables display student salary expenditures and pay scales for FY 1991. The pay scale was reflective as of April 1, 1991.

**Actual FY 1991 Student Salaries  
Expenditures by Program**

	Actual FY 1991
Instruction	\$ 3,082,016
Academic Support	2,389,736
Student Services	1,042,969
Institutional Support	622,194
Research	657,921
Public Service	303,155
Hospital	1,298,543
Physical Plant	1,201,079
Total	\$ 10,597,613

**April 1, 1991 Student Salary Pay Scale**

	Number of Students	%
\$3.35 to \$3.75	6	0.1
\$3.76 to \$4.25	3,394	61.6
\$4.26 to \$4.75	752	13.7
More than \$4.75	1,355	24.6
Total	5,507	100.0

**Graduate Teaching Assistants Fee Waiver.** The Board request in FY 1993 includes a \$641,996 reduction to general fee receipts to reflect a 100 percent graduate teaching assistants fee waiver. The current fee waiver is 75 percent. The following table reflects the reduction in general fee receipts at the seven universities. The Governor recommends a graduate teaching assistants fee waiver of 100 percent in FY 1993, as requested by the Regents.

	Agency Req. Increased Grad. Teaching Asst. Fee Waiver	Governor's Rec. FY 1993
KU	\$ 264,162	\$ 264,162
KSU	90,602	90,602
WSU	92,300	92,300
ESU	110,470	110,470
FHSU	22,165	22,165
PSU	38,056	38,056
KUMC	24,241	24,241
Total	<u>\$ 641,996</u>	<u>\$ 641,996</u>

### SECTION M

#### Other Operating Expenditures

**Request.** The Regents' institutions request \$5.2 million to provide a 5 percent base increase for other operating expenditure budgets, including the hospital operations program of KUMC. Shown below are the FY 1992 base budgets for other operating expenditures, excluding utilities, the request for FY 1993, and the Governor's recommendations. The Governor recommends \$4.0 million for a base increase of 4 percent for other operating expenditures and a 5 percent increase for the hospital operations at KUMC.

#### Other Operating Expenditures (Excluding Utilities) Program Maintenance Increases

Institution	FY 1992 Base	FY 1993 Maintenance 5% Request	Gov. Rec. FY 1993
KU	\$ 18,335,028	\$ 928,786	\$ 707,216
KSU	10,794,466	599,454	431,779
WSU	8,420,223	427,678	336,809
ESU	3,195,446	161,719	127,818
FHSU	2,946,255	149,384	117,850
PSU	3,418,613	406,075	136,745
KUMC	40,168,093	2,007,256	1,781,028
KSU-Ext.	6,037,914	304,432	241,517
KSUVMC	2,674,301	137,472	94,972
KSU-Salina	1,056,286	52,815	40,327
Total	<u>\$ 97,046,625</u>	<u>\$ 5,175,071</u>	<u>\$ 4,016,061</u>

Other operating expenditures (OOE) are used to purchase all commodities, equipment, goods, and services, other than utilities, used or acquired by the institutions. Expenditures from OOE budgets can include everything from pieces of scientific equipment to library books to faculty travel.

**Budgeting Procedures.** While most state agencies are required to submit detailed proposals showing how they wish to expend other operating funds, including identification of items by object of expenditure, such is not the case with the Regents' institutions. Under present budgeting procedures OOE increases are treated as additions to a base budget and, within available resources, institutional expenditures are constrained only by available resources and state purchasing requirements.

In addition, although State General Fund appropriations for salaries and other operating expenditures must be expended on items in those categories, expenditures from General Fees Funds are not so constrained. If salary expenditures are less than budgeted, an institution has the flexibility to increase OOE expenditures. Such a practice is frequently the case, as actual personnel turnover salary savings may often be in excess of the budgeted turnover salary savings (shrinkage) as applied to the gross salaries at each institution.

**Actual and Budgeted Expenditures.** By comparing the actual general use expenditures for other operating expenditures with those budgeted, it is possible to see whether institutions have had additional resources available for OOE. The following table shows the difference between legislatively approved OOE expenditures and the actual OOE expenditures. This is derived by comparing the approved budget for each fiscal year (adjusted for supplemental appropriations and one-time only items) with actual expenditures. The percentage change column shows the percentage increase or decrease which actual expenditures represented over budgeted expenditures.

**Difference Between Actual and Budgeted  
Other Operating Expenditures**

Year	KU		KSU		WSU	
	Difference	Percent	Difference	Percent	Difference	Percent
1977	\$ 265,379	3.1%	\$ 1,714,992	24.7%	\$ 322,080	9.3%
1978	377,165	4.1	1,646,414	20.9	2,370,232	9.5
1979	549,170	5.0	2,098,860	23.1	470,309	10.9
1980	480,349	4.2	1,695,182	18.3	302,912	6.8
1981	(44,438)	(0.4)	2,077,981	21.4	305,441	6.2
1982	(347,426)	(2.6)	2,246,080	21.0	456,104	8.7
1983	224,231	1.8	1,594,440	14.3	697,766	14.2
1984	493,675	3.6	1,452,784	11.4	823,449	14.1
1985	154,273	1.0	1,833,494	13.1	1,194,339	19.0
1986	855,157	5.0	1,518,325	10.1	728,538	10.3
1987	546,402	3.4	(154,311)	(1.1)	795,453	12.4
1988	244,351	1.3	672,440	4.1	1,396,917	15.6
1989	(374,073)	(1.9)	1,021,017	5.6	1,091,357	13.9
1990	(207,133)	(1.0)	(1,092,762)	(5.8)	375,809	4.3
1991	(145,379)	(0.7)	(564,861)	(2.9)	244,801	1.0

Year	ESU		FHSU		PSU	
	Difference	Percent	Difference	Percent	Difference	Percent
1977	\$ 269,531	16.2%	\$ 121,651	8.4%	\$ (17,863)	(1.1)%
1978	363,860	20.4	87,307	5.7	70,263	4.6
1979	351,768	17.2	51,804	2.6	114,483	6.2
1980	516,323	25.5	60,977	3.1	180,604	9.3
1981	486,863	22.9	87,004	4.1	101,944	4.6
1982	440,482	19.5	146,410	6.4	62,324	2.9
1983	126,742	5.6	87,928	4.0	11,754	0.5
1984	280,377	11.8	128,834	5.5	195,923	8.4
1985	163,571	6.7	263,936	10.1	149,498	6.0
1986	(38,919)	(1.4)	(25,362)	(0.9)	(79,868)	(2.7)
1987	17,967	0.7	32,144	1.2	120,999	5.4
1988	116,695	3.9	(11,051)	(0.3)	104,790	3.7
1989	160,909	4.9	(164,463)	(4.7)	(71,915)	(2.0)
1990	81,500	2.3	20,813	0.6	(362,538)	(9.0)
1991	(112,766)	(3.0)	(171,538)	(4.3)	(244,589)	(6.0)

At the January, 1990 meeting, the Board of Regents took official action to address the use of salary funding for other operating expenditures by the institutions. The Board approved the following policy: during any year in which general use expenditures for either salaries or other operating expenditures deviate from the budget for that purpose by more than .5 percent of the institution's total general use operating budget the institution shall adjust the appropriate budgetary bases requested for the succeeding fiscal year by not less than the amount by which the deviation exceeds .5 percent of the operating budget. Any exceptions to the preceding will require Board approval. Any requests by institutions for an exception will have to document why the deviation will not occur during the succeeding year.

An analysis by the Board of Regents' staff of shifting in FY 1991 between salaries and other operating expenditures by Kansas Regents' universities reflects that five were within the .5 percent threshold, established by the Board's policy, their budget requiring no adjustment due to that shifting. One institution (PSU) had shifts in excess of the .5 percent threshold and therefore should either permanently adjust their budgetary bases, to reflect the areas where funds were being expended, or request exception to the Board's policy. Three of the Regents universities (KU, WSU, and FHSU) experienced salary shrinkage in excess of that budgeted for them and therefore had an underexpenditure of salary funds. Those savings either have been or will be utilized for other operating expenditures by these institutions. WSU utilized its salary savings during FY 1991. KU and FHSU will utilize them for equipment purchase during FY 1992, when expenditures are made from their equipment reserve funds. KSU and PSU both experienced shortfalls in their salary budgets, which were financed by using funds originally budgeted for OOE. ESU experienced minimal additional salary shrinkage, which it combined with other OOE underexpenditures to transfer funds to its equipment reserve fund.

A summary table of budgeted and actual expenditures in each of the major object codes follows this section. The table also displays the .5 percent threshold for mandatory budget adjustments, applicable to each institution.

#### Summary of Actual FY 1991 Budgetary Shifting at Each Campus

**University of Kansas.** KU underexpended its budgeted salary expenditures by \$603,731 and its budgeted other operating expenditures by \$145,379. Of this amount \$178,913 was expended for maintenance projects and is therefore reflected as a capital improvement expenditure. Additionally, \$125,549 was transferred as KU's share of support for the University Press. Both of these items would be logically considered other operating expenditure but are not counted as such, due to technical nuances of the accounting process. Finally, KU transferred \$444,137 in FY 1991 underexpenditure to its equipment reserve fund.

**Kansas State University.** KSU underexpended its budget for other operating expenditures by \$564,861. Of this amount, \$147,878 was transferred into the equipment reserve fund. KSU overexpended its salary and wage budget, partially due to salary expenditures to accommodate enrollment growth and partially due to less than budgeted shrinkage. Considerable portions of the OOE savings were utilized to finance the overexpenditure in salaries. The utilities budget at KSU was underexpended by \$36,715, an amount which lapsed at the end of FY 1991.

**Wichita State University.** WSU underexpended its salary and wage budget by \$278,217, of which \$244,801 was expended for other operating expenditures. The original FY 1991 budget was financed by \$29,393 in anticipated savings from FY 1990, which did not occur. Therefore, FY 1991 expenditures are less than budgeted, since the spending occurred during FY 1990. This \$29,393 accounts for the majority of the \$33,416 in overall FY 1991 underspending which is identified in Attachment I.

**Emporia State University.** ESU underexpended its salary and wage budget by \$13,965 and its budget for other operating expenditures by \$112,766. Virtually all of the savings from both categories were included in a \$124,987 transfer to the equipment reserve fund. Emporia underexpended its utilities budget by \$36,258, an amount which lapsed at the end of FY 1991.

**Pittsburg State University.** PSU underexpended its budget for other operating expenditures by \$244,589, which is .9 percent of its total General Use budget. Most of these savings were utilized to finance a shortfall in salaries of \$227,509. Shortfalls in the salary budget at PSU largely resulted from insufficient budgeting of fringe benefits during FY 1991. Appropriations for FY 1992 were budgeted in a manner to adequately finance fringe benefits. Therefore, the University believes that the FY 1991 shifting from other operating expenditures to salaries will not recur. Accordingly, it requests exception to the Board's policy, which requires that the base budget be adjusted to reflect the actual expenditure patterns.

**Fort Hays State University.** FHSU underexpended its salary budget by \$115,993 and underexpended its other operating expenditures budget by \$171,538. Virtually all of the savings from both expenditure categories were transferred to the University's equipment reserve fund. Additionally, FHSU underexpended its utilities budget by \$22,721, an amount which lapsed at the end of FY 1991.

**FY 1991 Summary of Shifting Among  
Expenditure Objects**

FY 1991	Total Salaries	Utilities	OOE	Grand Total	Threshold for Budget Adjustment
<b>KU</b>					
Revised FY 91 Budget	\$120,301,255	\$5,362,764	\$21,361,232	\$147,025,251	\$735,126
Minus Actual Expend.	119,697,524	5,362,764	21,215,853	146,276,141	
Difference/Shift	(603,731)	0	(145,379)	(749,110)	
<b>KSU</b>					
Revised FY 91 Budget	113,238,774	5,434,390	19,547,462	138,220,626	691,103
Minus Actual Expend.	113,710,365	5,397,675	18,982,601	138,090,641	
Difference/Shift	471,591	(36,715)	(564,861)	(129,985)	
<b>WSU</b>					
Revised FY 91 Budget	51,784,626	2,975,434	9,274,961	64,035,021	320,175
Minus Actual Expend.	51,506,409	2,975,434	9,519,762	64,001,605	
Difference/Shift	(278,217)	0	244,801	(33,416)	

<u>FY 1991</u>	<u>Total Salaries</u>	<u>Utilities</u>	<u>OOE</u>	<u>Grand Total</u>	<u>Threshold for Budget Adjustment</u>
<b>ESU</b>					
Revised FY 91 Budget	21,898,062	723,728	3,733,771	26,355,561	131,778
Minus Actual Expend.	21,884,097	687,470	3,621,005	26,192,572	
Difference/Shift	(13,965)	(36,258)	(112,766)	(162,989)	
<b>PSU</b>					
Revised FY 91 Budget	23,279,744	1,030,415	4,087,508	28,397,667	141,988
Minus Actual Expend.	23,507,253	1,030,415	3,842,919	28,380,587	
Difference/Shift	227,509	0	(244,589)	(17,080)	
<b>FHSU</b>					
Revised FY 91 Budget	20,760,331	880,158	4,016,533	25,657,022	128,285
Minus Actual Expend.	20,644,338	857,437	3,844,995	25,346,770	
Difference/Shift	(115,993)	(22,721)	(171,538)	(310,252)	

Source: Kansas Board of Regents

### Equipment Reserve Fund

Regents' institution's appropriations have generally provided authority to the presidents or chancellor to transfer unexpended General Fee Fund balances below the authorized expenditure level from the Fund to an equipment reserve fund. The purpose being to allow for the accumulation of funds for the purchase of major equipment items or for the orderly acquisition of equipment at the end of a fiscal year and during the beginning of the next. During FY 1991, six institutions transferred a total of \$691,721 from general fees funds into equipment reserve funds. The following table indicates the institutions, the amount transferred, and the percent of fees transferred out of the total general fees expended by the institution.

### FY 1991 Transfer From General Fees Fund to Equipment Reserve Fund

<u>Institution</u>	<u>General Fees Transferred</u>	<u>Percent of General Fee Expenditures</u>
KU	\$ 444,137	1.0%
KSU	147,878	0.5
KSU-Vet. Med.	88,309	2.7
PSU	706	--
FHSU	285,704	6.0
ESU	124,987	2.2
Total	<u>\$ 691,721</u>	

## SECTION N

## Utilities

**FY 1991 Actual, FY 1992 Base,  
FY 1993 Base Request and Recommendation**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Actual FY 1991</u>	<u>Base Budget FY 1992</u>	<u>Gov. Rec. FY 1992</u>	<u>Agency Req. FY 1993</u>	<u>Gov. Rec. FY 1993</u>
KU	\$ 5,362,764	\$ 5,581,842	\$ 5,581,842	\$ 5,638,224	\$ 5,496,332
KSU	5,397,675	4,951,879	4,951,879	5,009,050	4,846,303
WSU	2,975,434	2,649,739	2,975,434	2,666,428	2,939,366
ESU	687,470	701,444	701,444	708,529	660,130
FHSU	857,437	839,518	839,518	847,998	839,518
PSU	1,030,415	1,020,111	1,020,111	1,030,415	1,004,144
KUMC	4,954,617	4,774,559	4,774,559	4,791,499	4,706,388
KSU-Ext.	-	708,095	708,095	708,095	695,590
KSUVMC	727,411	729,517	729,517	736,886	729,517
KCT	171,463	121,498	121,498	121,498	121,498
Total	<u>\$ 22,164,686</u>	<u>\$ 22,078,202</u>	<u>\$ 22,403,897</u>	<u>\$ 22,258,622</u>	<u>\$ 22,038,786</u>

The current legislative practice of providing separate line item appropriations for utilities began with the 1976 Session. The policy, as reflected in the subcommittee report of the House Ways and Means Committee, reads as follows:

1. Appropriations for utilities should be separate line items to permit close monitoring of appropriations and expenditures.
2. Utility costs should be fully funded and the institutions should not be required to shift funds from other purposes to finance utilities.
3. Legislative budget review should focus on consumption to assure that campuses are making efforts to limit consumption.

The 1983 Legislature initiated a practice of allowing unexpended utility appropriations at the end of the fiscal year to be reappropriated and be used in the subsequent fiscal year for energy saving capital improvements. The 1984 and 1985 Legislatures included such provisions in appropriations for fiscal years 1985 and 1986 respectively. The 1986 Legislature modified this practice as follows: (1) anticipated unexpended balances at the end of FY 1986 were estimated; (2) estimated savings were reappropriated to FY 1987; (3) institutions were allowed to utilize 25 percent of the estimated reappropriation for energy saving capital improvements; and (4) institutions were not allowed to expend savings in excess of the estimate. The 1987 and the 1989 Legislatures did not reappropriate utility savings for energy saving capital improvements.

The following table contains data on actual utility expenditures in FY 1990 and FY 1991, as well as the approved FY 1992 base. The table indicates relatively modest growth at most of the institutions with actual reductions when comparing FY 1990 to FY 1991 utility funding at Kansas State University Veterinary Medical Center. The Governor's FY 1993 recommendation takes into account anticipated energy savings due to the Energy Conservation program through the Kansas Development Financed Authority. The Governor also recommends base adjustments for Wichita State University in FY 1992 and FY 1993. The Governor recommends \$472,678 in utility

expenditures associated with servicing new facilities in FY 1993. The Legislature typically reviews utility expenditures and the potential for savings or supplementation in March.

**Actual and Budgeted Utility Expenditures  
FY 1990 – FY 1992**

Institution	Actual FY 1990	Actual FY 1991	Base Budget FY 1992	Difference FY 92 Base FY 91 Exp.	Percent Difference FY 91-FY 92
KU	\$ 5,259,342	\$ 5,362,764	\$ 5,581,842	\$ 219,078	4.1
KSU	5,246,533	5,397,675	4,951,879	(445,796)	(8.3)
WSU	2,801,125	2,975,434	2,649,739	(325,695)	(10.9)
ESU	675,429	687,470	701,444	13,974	2.0
FHSU	821,867	857,437	839,518	(17,919)	(2.1)
PSU	965,332	1,030,415	1,020,111	(10,304)	(1.0)
KUMC	4,612,772	4,954,617	4,774,559	(180,058)	3.6
KSUVMC	735,305	727,411	729,517	2,106	0.3
KSU-Est.	-	-	708,095	-	-
KSU-Salina	143,742	171,463	121,498	(49,965)	(29.1)
Total	<u>\$ 21,261,447</u>	<u>\$ 22,164,686</u>	<u>\$ 22,078,202</u>	<u>\$ (86,484)</u>	<u>(0.4)</u>

**FY 1993 Requested and Recommended Utility Expenditures**

Institution	Total Requested FY 1993	Gov. Rec. FY 1993	Difference
KU	\$ 5,759,012	\$ 5,572,787	\$ (186,225)
KSU	5,009,050	4,846,303	(162,747)
WSU	2,888,787	3,151,649	262,862
ESU	708,529	660,130	(48,399)
FHSU	981,118	972,638	(8,480)
PSU	1,030,415	1,004,144	(26,271)
KUMC	4,856,667	4,757,208	(99,459)
KSUVMC	736,886	729,517	(7,369)
KSU-Ext.	708,095	695,590	(12,505)
KSU-Salina	121,498	121,498	--
Total	<u>\$ 22,800,057</u>	<u>\$ 22,511,464</u>	<u>\$ (288,593)</u>

## SECTION O

## Servicing New Buildings

**Request.** The FY 1993 requests of the institutions include a total of \$1,188,624 for costs associated with servicing of new buildings. The requests include 31.0 FTE new classified positions, as well as utility and other operating expenditures funding for facilities anticipated to become operational in FY 1993.

**FY 1993 Request  
Servicing New Buildings**

Institution/Facility	Classified FTE	Salaries	OOE	Utilities	FY 1993 Total Req.	Gov. Rec. FY 1993
<b>KU</b>						
Regents' Center	0.8	\$ 15,200	\$ 3,586	\$ 13,944	\$ 32,730	\$ 13,944
Lied Performing Arts Center	5.0	47,500	15,188	59,063	121,751	59,063
Nelson Research Lab	0.2	3,800	887	3,448	8,135	3,448
Addition to Parrot Athletic Center	2.5	45,600	11,400	44,333	101,333	-
<b>WSU</b>						
Science Classroom Building	12.9	245,100	60,867	206,946	512,913	206,946
Center for Entrepreneurship	0.3	5,700	1,570	5,337	12,607	5,337
Eck Stadium Addition	0.7	9,247	2,304	10,076	21,627	-
<b>FHSU</b>						
Sternberg Memorial Museum	6.7	126,730	39,936	133,120	299,786	133,120
<b>KUMC</b>						
Sutherland Institute	1.9	35,150	8,712	33,880	77,742	50,820
<b>TOTAL</b>	<u>31.0</u>	<u>\$ 534,027</u>	<u>\$ 144,450</u>	<u>\$ 510,147</u>	<u>\$ 1,188,624</u>	<u>\$ 472,678</u>

Financing for servicing of new buildings has traditionally been requested according to a formula which allocates funds upon square footage. In most years, the Legislature has financed the request. The Board revised its formulas in FY 1987 which was further revised by the 1990 Legislature. The FY 1993 requests are based upon: (1) one FTE staff position (\$19,000) for each 10,500 gross square feet (GSF); (2) a statewide average OOE rate per GSF of \$0.45 cents in FY 1993; and (3) utility costs differentiated by institution and type of program. The Governor's recommendation does not provide any additional FTE positions for the servicing of new buildings in FY 1993. The Governor does recommend funding for utility costs only or \$472,678. However, the Governor does not recommend any funding for the servicing costs associated with Eck Stadium (WSU) or Parrot Athletic Center (KU) additions.

### III. MISSION RELATED PROGRAM ENHANCEMENTS

The Regents institutions for FY 1993 have requested a total of \$5,163,000 for mission related program enhancements. The requested amount is distributed among the institutions on the basis of FY 1991 weighted credit hours. The Regents did not renew their request for funding the third year of the Margin of Excellence. The Board of Regents directed the institutions to request the mission related program enhancements on two broad categories, libraries and equipment. The following table reflects the total mission related program enhancements for each agency, including the amounts requested for libraries and equipment.

#### FY 1993 Requested Mission Related Program Enhancements

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Library Enhancement</u>	<u>Equipment Enhancement</u>	<u>FY 1993 Total Req.</u>	<u>FY 1993 Gov. Rec.</u>
KU	\$ 612,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,512,000	\$ --
KSU	433,000	522,000	955,000	--
WSU	216,400	404,600	621,000	--
ESU	177,500	146,500	324,000	--
PSU	117,000	200,000	317,000	--
FHSU	52,000	225,000	277,000	--
KUMC	260,000	664,000	924,000	--
KSU-Ext.	--	150,000	150,000	--
KSUVMC	10,000	53,000	63,000	--
KSU-Salina	--	20,000	20,000	--
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,877,900</b>	<b>\$ 3,285,100</b>	<b>\$ 5,163,000</b>	<b>\$ --</b>

### IV. Peer Comparisons

The peer comparisons are based on the concept of comparisons of the institutions to a set of selected similar institutions. Peer institutions were first selected by a Regents' task force in 1976 from states whose ability to support public education, higher education pattern, and populations were determined to be relatively similar to that of Kansas. The major basis for comparison was similarity in program responsibilities. Comparison institutions were to be similar in enrollment measures, and broad "missions" were to be similar. In addition, the institutions had to be publicly controlled, characteristics of image, expenditures, emphasis, headcount enrollment, and doctoral enrollment had to be comparable, the institutions were not to be from either heavily or sparsely populated states, and no peer group was to be larger than five institutions. The Board of Regents designated peer institutions are listed in the table below.

<u>Regents' Institution</u>	<u>Peer Institution</u>
University of Kansas	University of Colorado University of Iowa University of North Carolina -- Chapel Hill University of Oklahoma University of Oregon
Kansas State University	Colorado State University Iowa State University North Carolina State University Oklahoma State University Oregon State University
Wichita State University	University of Akron Portland State University Virginia Commonwealth University University of North Carolina -- Greensboro University of Wisconsin -- Milwaukee Western Michigan University
Emporia State University Fort Hays State University Pittsburg State University	Eastern New Mexico University Murray State University Western Carolina University Central Oklahoma University Eastern Washington University Northern Arizona University

**Cost Studies.** A comprehensive cost study is conducted on each peer institution by the Kansas institutions using definitions and procedures developed by the Regents' Task Force. The studies include data on faculty salaries and fringe benefits, classified salaries and benefits, student wages, computing support, and other operating expenditures. The institutions collect information on general use funds, including the State General Fund, tuition and student fee revenue, land grant funds, and sponsored research overhead. Approximately 85 percent of the total operating budget of the peer institution is examined, however, activities such as public services, athletics, and utilities are excluded.

**Relative Funding for Regents' Institutions.** The following table displays each university's funding relative to its peers in faculty salaries, other operating expenditures, and overall financing. It may be noted that the three larger institutions are funded at approximately the same levels in faculty salaries with some differences in other operating expenditures. The regional institutions show more variance in both salaries and wages and other operating expenditures, but less variance in total university funding than the three research institutions.

**FY 1990 Relative Funding for Kansas Institutions**

Institution	Faculty Salaries(a)	Other Operating Expend.(b)	Total University Funding
University of Kansas	92.1	70	87.2
Kansas State University	91.7	65.0	80.5
Wichita State University	91.3	63.6	80.7
Emporia State University	92.7	61.4	91.5
Fort Hays State University	95.5	52.8	87.0
Pittsburg State University	94.8	69.5	93.2
Total	92.3	65.8	84.6

Source: Kansas Board of Regents,  
Oct. 1991

- a) AAUP Salary Study of Faculty 1989-90.  
b) Cost Study Data FY 1989.

Compared to FY 1990, relative salary funding in FY 1991 decreased at all institutions. Compared to FY 1988, relative funding increases range from 0.2 percent at the University of Kansas to 7.8 percent at Fort Hays State University in FY 1991. FY 1991 systemwide relative salary funding decreased by 2.5 percent, when compared to FY 1990 data. The Regents maintain that relative funding change is best viewed on a multi-year basis, since various mathematical aberrations can distort changes during a single year. The FY 1991 systemwide relative salary funding has increased by 0.2 percent, compared to FY 1988, which is the last year prior to the Margin of Excellence. The original Margin of Excellence computations were developed from FY 1987 faculty salary data. However, the Regents suggest that due to the limited faculty salary increases (3 percent for 6 months) in FY 1988 the relative salary funding data is substantially less than originally projected. The following table displays the relative funding of faculty salaries for FY 1987 through FY 1991.

**Comparison of Relative Funding – Faculty Salaries  
FY 1987 – FY 1991**

Institution	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991
University of Kansas	92.1%	88.6%	90.9%	92.1%	88.8%
Kansas State University	91.8	87.4	89.6	91.7	90.5
Wichita State University	89.2	88.2	89.7	91.3	89.3
Emporia State University	90.2	87.2	90.0	92.7	90.4
Pittsburg State University	89.9	89.4	92.6	95.5	90.5
Fort Hays State University	86.7	84.8	90.6	94.8	92.6
System Total	90.9%	87.9%	90.4%	92.3%	89.8%

## ATTACHMENT A

**OVERVIEW OF THE GOVERNOR'S FY 1993 BUDGET  
RECOMMENDATIONS ON REGENTS' SYSTEMWIDE ISSUES**

Request	Requested General Use Funds Amount (Millions)	Governor's	
		Amount	Recommendation
Student Salaries -- 5% Increase	\$ 0.4	\$ 0.2	The Governor recommends a 2.5 percent increase.
Unclassified Salaries -- 5% Increase	16.8	8.6	For unclassified the Governor recommends a 2.5 percent increase.
Classified Pay Plan -- 2.5% Increase	3.1	3.0	For classified employees the Governor recommends step movement of 2.5 percent and longevity pay.
Other Operating Expenditures -- 5% Increase	5.2	4.0	The Governor recommends a 4 percent increase for other operating expenditures.
FY 1993 Enrollment Adjustment	3.1	3.1	Concur.
Graduate Teaching Assistant Fee Waiver -- 100%	0.6	0.6	Concur.
Mission Related Program Enhancements	5.2	--	The only enhancement is additional campus security at WSU.
Restore 1% State General Fund lapse	4.0	--	Did not recommend.
Salary and Wage Shrinkage Reduction	1.2	--	Did not recommend.
FY 1992 General Fee Release (0.3) or Shortfall (0.9)	1.3	--	The Governor does not recommend the fee release; but does recommend supplemental State General Fund support for WSU (0.6).
Supplemental FY 1992 Enrollment Adjustment	4.8	--	Did not recommend.
Additional 1% Regents Retirement	2.5	--	Did not recommend.
Servicing New Buildings	1.2	0.5	Recommend utility costs only.