



UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
LAW CENTER
INSTITUTE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION LAW & GOVERNANCE
100 LAW CENTER
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77204-6060
713.743.2075 713.743.2085 FAX
WWW.LAW.UH.EDU/LAWCENTER/PROGRAMS/IHELG

MICHAEL A. OLIVAS
William B. Bates
Distinguished Chair in Law
Director, IHELG
molivas@uh.edu
713.743.2078

DEBORAH Y. JONES
Program Manager
dyjones@uh.edu

**Institutional Aspirations Amidst
Financial Distress:
Public Institutions in Georgia as a Case Study**

IHELG Monograph

09-07

J. Douglas Toma
University of Georgia
Associate Professor, Institute of Higher Education
Dean, Franklin Residential College
206 Meigs Hall
Athens, Georgia 30602
706-542-4836, office
706-614-6104, mobile
jdt@uga.edu

Beth-Anne Schuelke Leech
PhD Student
Department of Public Administration and Policy
School of Public and International Affairs
University of Georgia
(706) 850-0551

© J. Douglas Toma and Beth-Anne Schuelke Leech, 2010



University of Houston Law Center/Institute for Higher Education Law and Governance (IHELG)

The University of Houston Institute for Higher Education Law and Governance (IHELG) provides a unique service to colleges and universities worldwide. It has as its primary aim providing information and publications to colleges and universities related to the field of higher education law, and also has a broader mission to be a focal point for discussion and thoughtful analysis of higher education legal issues. IHELG provides information, research, and analysis for those involved in managing the higher education enterprise internationally through publications, conferences, and the maintenance of a database of individuals and institutions. IHELG is especially concerned with creating dialogue and cooperation among academic institutions in the United States, and also has interests in higher education in industrialized nations and those in the developing countries of the Third World.

The UHLC/IHELG works in a series of concentric circles. At the core of the enterprise is the analytic study of postsecondary institutions--with special emphasis on the legal issues that affect colleges and universities. The next ring of the circle is made up of affiliated scholars whose research is in law and higher education as a field of study. Many scholars from all over the world have either spent time in residence, or have participated in Institute activities. Finally, many others from governmental agencies and legislative staff concerned with higher education participate in the activities of the Center. All IHELG monographs are available to a wide audience, at low cost.

Programs and Resources

IHELG has as its purpose the stimulation of an international consciousness among higher education institutions concerning issues of higher education law and the provision of documentation and analysis relating to higher education development. The following activities form the core of the Institute's activities:

Higher Education Law Library

Houston Roundtable on Higher Education Law

Houston Roundtable on Higher Education Finance

Publication series

Study opportunities

Conferences

Bibliographical and document service

Networking and commentary

Research projects funded internally or externally

Institutional Aspirations Amidst Financial Distress: Public Institutions in Georgia as a Case Study

J. Douglas Toma and Beth-Anne Leech
University of Georgia

Abstract

American universities and colleges across types are pursuing strategies to position themselves for greater prestige. In relation to the broader aspirations of the 35 public institutions in Georgia, we examine the recent sudden and significant cutbacks in state appropriated funds. We find that institutions of various types are reacting differently in proposing the cuts within their discretion, somewhat in ways reflective of their missions and aspirations. We draw on August, 2009 financial data for each of the 35 University System of Georgia institutions related to proposed budget reductions of four, six, or eight percent for the 2010 fiscal year, the second year of the cutbacks which began in Summer, 2008 with a eight percent cutback for FY 2009. We also draw on interviews with the presidents of 18 USG institutions and also faculty and senior administrators at five of these focusing on institutional aspirations and conducted shortly before the onset of the global financial crisis. In concluding, we consider whether budget reduction decisions are putting institutional visions at risk – and whether there is an opportunity here to reorient visions in more realistic and productive directions.

Introduction and Overview

Across most sectors, higher education institutions are fixated on enhancing their prestige, recognizing it to be linked to their ability to attract resources. Despite the impressive diversity of institution types, the relative autonomy of individual universities and colleges, and the vast differences in respective resources available to them, higher education institutions in the United States tend to arrive, independently, at what amounts to a common aspiration (Toma, 2008). They are eerily similar in vision, in fact, seemingly obsessed with “moving to the next level.” Institutions seek to become more like those directly above them on the prestige hierarchy recognized within American higher education. They not only portray their ambitions using similar rhetoric, but also attempt to operationalize them through a rather generic set of strategies, acting

in the entrepreneurial manner that has never been more characteristic of American institutions (Bok, 2002; Ehrenberg, 2002; Geiger, 2004; Kirp, 2003; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2005; Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy, 2005).

Universities and colleges are attempting to position themselves for increased reputation through efforts to attract more accomplished students and noteworthy faculty, as well as making significant investments in facilities, academic initiatives, athletics, and so on (Toma, 2008). In prosperous times, institutions can make more considered decisions about funding new programs, activities, and infrastructure to support the drive for greater prestige. However, universities and colleges often must implement budgetary cutbacks quickly and within structural, political, psychological, and cultural constraints, without the luxury of careful planning. Convenience thus tends to govern management decisions, as with discretionary spending freezes and equal cuts across units without regard to their productivity or strategic importance.

Enhancing reputation continues to matter, however, and is more strategic than equitable in operation. Institutional prestige represents an asset for institutions earned over time – and can create strategic advantage in attracting resources, both human and financial, needed to realize aspirations (Brewer, Gates, and Goldman, 2002; Shattock, 2003; Rein and Rabinovitz 1978; Nakamura and Smallwood, 1980). Universities and colleges are thus increasingly competing with one another, seeking advantage that will be reflected in various rankings and otherwise (Volkwein and Sweitzer 2006). Whether institutions will actually realize the advantages they seek is an open question. But the clear perception is that making the investments thought to attract more accomplished students and noteworthy faculty is essential (Toma, 2008; Brewer, Gates, and Goodman, 2002; Weisbrod, et al. 2008). Accordingly, they are making strategic decisions to allocate scarce resources to these initiatives and perhaps also away from other commitments, as institutions, ultimately, have to balance budgets (Brewer, Gates, and Goldman, 2002; Schick 1980).

The severe downturn in the economy in 2008 quickly presented public universities and colleges with mid-year budget cutbacks triggered by state government revenue shortfalls. Georgia reduced its original higher education budget of \$21.2 billion for the 2009 fiscal year by

ten percent – with a similar reduction expected in the year following. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (USG), which oversees the 35 public colleges and universities in Georgia (there is a separate system for technical colleges), mandated only a cutback, not how institutions achieve these reductions while supporting ongoing needs (and aspirations). The USG requested proposed cuts of four, six, or eight percent in August, 2009 for FY 2010. We draw on these data. Public higher education institutions have often had to bear a disproportionate share of budget cuts during economic downturns (Lauth, 1994; Willoughby and Lauth, 2003), so the climate across campuses statewide is not marked by optimism.

Question and Frameworks

We focus on the following question: How are institutional aspirations and strategies toward attempting to realize them reflected in the budget cuts? In doing so, we draw on research and theory in several areas: corporate strategy, institutional theory, resource dependency theory, organizational identification, and retrenchment. We cover each briefly.¹

Universities and colleges, like business firms, adopt strategies, ideally attempting to position for advantage over competitors in one of three ways: offering a standard product at a lower cost; marketing differentiated, often luxury, products that can attract a higher price; or focusing on a targeted (or niche) market (Porter, 1980). Treacy and Wiersema (1993) term these value disciplines, framing them as: operational excellence (as a means to lower costs); product leadership (through cutting edge products); and customer intimacy (to meet their specific wants and needs). Even within one of these value disciplines (or positions), institutions must underscore their distinctiveness to compete in a crowded marketplace, but in reality the aspirations and strategies they adopt are causing them to become increasingly similar. As they chase the same goal in roughly the same manner, the needed claims they make about being different are essentially superficial – much more about look and feel more than related to substance, say related to the traditional academic core (Toma, 2008).

¹ In a September, 2009 paper presented at the Consortium for Research on Higher Education meeting in Porto, Portugal, Doug made theories on strategy, institutionalism, and resource dependency the centerpiece of his paper.

Institutional theory and resource dependency theory are also instructive in considering why universities and colleges are so obsessed with prestige. Institutions attempt to move to the next level – essentially replicating those with more prestige – to gain legitimacy (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). They also respond to the demands of the external entities on which they rely for support, attempting to minimize that dependency, as possible. Increasing prestige, they assume, will result in more available resources and thus more autonomy (Pfeffer and Salanick, 1978; Pfeffer, 1982). Universities and colleges with the highest status and most legitimacy are usually the wealthiest – and, accordingly, the most independent of external control. These pulls are so strong within higher education that there appears to be no realistic alternative to positioning for prestige as institutions establish aspirations and determine strategy (Toma, 2009a). Also, there is neither a set status hierarchy nor formal structural barriers in U.S. higher education. So, there is always the hope of moving up – winning the lottery, in effect. In fact, given the perceived connection with resources, it is arguably not realistic for an institution to opt out of the prestige race, saying, in effect, “we are doing fine and should relax.” The desire to improve in stature also has the benefit of being attractive across internal constituencies – it is the rare matter that is just as appealing to senior administrators as it is to faculty members.

Aspirations are not only associated with resources, however. There are intangible advantages associated with prestige within organizations. Because people come to understand themselves in reference to the organizations with which they associate, they are more likely to celebrate their connections with prestigious institutions, making just about everything on campus easier to achieve (Toma, Dubrow, and Hartley, 2005; Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail, 1994). When the advantages of enhanced organizational identification combine with the promise of greater resources and the security of increased legitimacy, aspiring as an institution to enhance prestige is essentially obligatory, no matter the institution type.

Finally, we also draw theory and research from public administration about how organizations manage cutbacks (Bozeman and Straussman, 1982; Levine, 1979). Governmental budgeting, including at universities and colleges, is generally incremental. The foundations of incremental budgeting are completely overturned during periods of cutback or decline.

Incremental budgeting is predictable, repetitive, and non-threatening, while decremental budgeting (or budget cutbacks) is redistributive, erratic, unpredictable, without historic precedence, and controversial (Behn, 1985). Behn (1985) argues that incremental budgeting requires little careful thought or strategy; cutting a budget, on the other hand, requires a significant re-examination of priorities and expenditures.

Leadership is thus an important component to the response of colleges and universities to periods of retrenchment (Mingle, 1981). But the forces keeping an organization going along the same path are so formidable that change is the rare exception (Kaufman, 1971). Even with the strongest leadership, financial cutbacks and organizational retrenchment create substantial stress for managers and employees (Bozeman and Slusher, 1979; Whetten, 1980). Such stress can divert managers' attention away from the actual problem and distort the problem solving process. Managers in crises or highly stressful situations, often become very conservative in their approaches to dealing with problems (Whetten, 1981). During times of retrenchment and cutbacks, managers may prefer across-the-board cuts, rather than the substantial reassessment of organizational goals and activities which frequently involves higher emotional energy (Whetten, 1981).

Furthermore, organizations that have experienced long periods of growth will often try to manage decreases in resources using the same resource allocation techniques and processes that have been used during periods of growth (Starbuck et al, 1978). Individuals and organizations tend to attribute success to internal abilities and processes and failure to external circumstances, which suggests that managers in organizations that have grown will likely attribute this growth to good management (Whetten, 1981). At the same time, any declines will be attributed to the external environment, rather than poor management or processes. Thus, organizations may not view periods of decline as indicative of the need to evaluate their processes (Whetten, 1981). In other words, higher education institutions may not see periods of retrenchment as opportunities to reassess their goals, priorities, or activities, since these are perceived as the foundation of their growth and success.

Research Design

In exploring the alignment between managing budget cuts and advancing strategies toward realizing institutional aspirations, we draw on two data sources. The first is the August, 2009 proposal from each of the 35 University System of Georgia universities and colleges addressing how they would make reductions of four, six, or eight percent in FY 2010, after having made a ten percent cutback in FY 2009. The proposals followed a standard format, with institutions placing proposed reductions into set categories, enabling us to easily standard our data across institutions. We also draw on documentary evidence and interviews with presidents of 18 representative USG universities and colleges, as well as numerous interviews at four campuses representative of the broad institution types in the system (research university, large comprehensive, smaller comprehensive, community college). We conducted these interviews on campus in early 2008, before the economic crisis, focusing on institutional aspirations.

The USG divides its institutions into four types: research universities, regional universities, state universities, state colleges, and two-year colleges. In Spring, 2008, we conducted interviews focused on institutional aspirations with the president of each of the four research universities – the University of Georgia, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia State University, and the Medical College of Georgia – and well as interviewing several senior administrators and faculty members at Georgia and Georgia State. We did the same at Georgia Southern University, which is one of the two regional universities designated within the USG, the other being Valdosta State University. Kennesaw State University has the characteristics of a regional university, but is not classified as such, so we keep its data with the state universities, which is the third institution type. Among state universities, we interviewed presidents, again about institutional aspirations, at Armstrong Atlantic State University, Columbus State University, Fort Valley State University, Georgia College and State University, Kennesaw State, North Georgia College and State University, Southern Polytechnic State University, Savannah State University, and the University of West Georgia, with further interviews at Georgia College. (Other state universities include Albany State University, Augusta State University, Clayton State University, and Georgia Southwestern State University). At the state colleges, we interviewed the

presidents at Dalton State College and Gainesville State College (and others in the group include Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, the College of Coastal Georgia, Georgia Gwinnett College, Gordon College, Macon State College, and Middle Georgia College). Finally, we interviewed the president at Georgia Highlands College and the president and others at Georgia Perimeter College among the two-year colleges (the others being Atlanta Metropolitan College, Bainbridge College, Darton College, East Georgia College, South Georgia College College, and Waycross).

We include a summary of the interview questions in Appendix A. We also interviewed the presidents at 21 private institutions connected with the Atlanta market. In analyzing the data, we employed the constant comparative approach to identify common themes and emerging patterns (Glazer and Strauss, 1967). We explored whether the categories and subcategories I generated were internally consistent (internal convergence), but distinct from one another (external divergence) (Marshall and Rossman, 1999). We also searched throughout the analysis process for negative instances and for rival structures (Glazer and Strauss, 1967).

Findings

From the interviews, we conclude that aspirations at universities and colleges with even modest selectivity typically amount to a desire to enhance institutional prestige. Advancing an institutional vision to "move to the next level" through employing a few generic strategies is the default position in selective American higher education: attracting accomplished students, hiring noteworthy faculty, developing appealing academic programs, and improving the collegiate infrastructure on campus. Having divided institutions into types, the USG expects them serve different types of students with different needs. But among non-selective institutions, there is still typically a desire to increase in level, as with community colleges seeking to offer four-year degrees and small regional colleges adding residences to attract students from outside of the immediate area. The primary difference in moving down the prestige ladder among public institutions is the increased emphasis on the instructional mission of the institution. In the discussion below, we discuss aspirations and strategies before moving to the question of how

these are reflected in the proposed FY 2010 budget reductions proposed by the 35 USG institutions.

Aspirations. The status hierarchy in American higher education is reasonably clear, including as captured each year in *U.S. News and World Report* rankings. Institutions know there is a "next level" and understand fairly well the step required to reach it. They are also not bashful about announcing their intentions, even if only marginally plausible, as simply doing so tends to place an institution among others, thus adding legitimacy.

Among research universities, Georgia State, for instance, aspires to progress (as it sees it) from a "commuter" institution established to serve Atlanta students into a destination for accomplished students seeking a residential collegiate experience in an urban setting. Georgia State is also interested in continuing to advance as a research university, becoming recognized as akin to the more developed Georgia Tech and the University of Georgia. So, it employs various strategies toward attempting to realize these aspirations, investing in infrastructure in areas such as housing and research. Georgia Tech and Georgia, meanwhile, respectively aspire to become MIT and CalTech or Virginia and Texas, thus moving up a class.

Comprehensive institutions are also interested in "the next level," seeking the more accomplished students and adding, as they can, the graduate programs and research activity associated with more prestigious flagship institutions. There is a robust competition, for example, between Kennesaw State and Georgia Southern, two larger comprehensives, for both suburban Atlanta students and permission from the university system to add graduate programs. Pursuing both strategies moves them closer to their aspiration of assuming the characteristics of a state flagship. These institutions continue to serve their local market, as with Kennesaw drawing from the suburbs north of Atlanta. But they are also interested extending their reach to be more like Tech or UGA, beginning to offer the trappings, such as campus residences at Kennesaw and an honors program at Southern, needed to do so. Armstrong Atlantic, a smaller comprehensive (termed a state university by USG), is following the same model in attempting to spread its influence beyond the immediate Savannah market, including through developing residences and dining to attract full-time, residential students.

Even aspirations at state colleges and community colleges, while expressed in terms of access, are akin to other kinds of institutions. Several Georgia state colleges, such as Dalton State, are adding four-year degree programs – the "next level" for them – successfully contending there is a need, including due to mission drift by other institutions. At non-selective institutions like community colleges, there is also a prestige advantage in increasing in size. In representing itself, Georgia Perimeter, a large two-year college in suburban Atlanta, certainly cites enrollment growth of it fulfilling its purposes. But it also emphasizes possibilities for transfer to prestigious institutions, having formalized relationships with several institutions, including leading public and private ones including nationally (Columbia University and Pepperdine University, for instance). So, even institutions devoted to access tend to highlight initiatives or associations to which prestige commonly attaches.

But mission also matters. Institutions do not only understand where they want to go, but also know what they must do. For instance, particularly in a coordinated state system as in Georgia, the state colleges must serve the instruction-related needs of their local region before delving into other activities, including those associated with "upward drift." There is also the question of whether these aspirations need to be realistic or assertions about prestige and even distinctiveness need to be accurate, especially when received by less sophisticated audiences. In sales, accuracy is sometimes a secondary concern. Nevertheless, aspirations can be productive. They can energize a campus, making it more dynamic. But when moving toward to next level works best is when it causes institutions to differentiate themselves. For instance, Columbus State has developed its fine arts program into a regional leader; Georgia College has adopted the public liberal arts college mission; and Fort Valley State and Savannah State, both public HBCUs, have continued to emphasize their historic mission while also enhancing their academic profiles.

Strategies. Like business firms, universities and colleges attempt to achieve their aspirations through positioning for advantage over competitors. Community colleges offer standard products at low prices, the first position type outlined by Porter (1980) and Treacy and

Wiersema (1993), with strategies supporting the overall approach. But these institutions also know the advantages of people viewing their organization as distinctive, central, and enduring – and thus wanting to enhance and announce their association with it. Again, when institutional identification is strong, everything is easier (Toma, Dubrow, and Hartley, 2005; Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail, 1994). So, reputation still matters, even at institutions with an access mission. Only instead of garnering prestige through admissions, endowment, or research numbers, non-selective institutions concentrate on enhancing and celebrating their stature through enrollment growth, relevant programs, and personal accomplishments.

Institutions that are even somewhat selective must sell more than just affordable cost. In the Atlanta market, most competition occurs among institutions having established a niche, the second type of position. They offer a set of attributes that are appealing to a certain type of prospective student, attempting to enhance these to improve their position among competitors. The public universities and colleges among these are similar in price, reputation, and even academic program. But their respective approaches to collegiate life are quite distinctive: whether the urban experience at Georgia State; the small town residential one at Georgia Southern; the suburban character of Kennesaw; or the liberal arts college feel of Georgia College or North Georgia. The strategies that they accordingly employ accentuate these characteristics, such as building loft style dorms at State, adding a residential complex at Armstrong Atlantic, or renovating the historic core campus at Georgia College.

Another kind of niche involves a product differentiated on substance as well, like a religious college, a non-elite small college selling a more intimate experience at a somewhat higher price, or one with specialized programs like Southern Poly. The third position type is product leadership. Liberal arts colleges and private research universities can attract a higher price because they provide something akin to a luxury product, something to which prestige attaches and that offers a premium experience. State flagships have sufficient prestige that they tend to have some elements of a luxury experience. Strategies at these institutions tend to emphasize not only look and feel, which remains important, but also the advantages associated with a leading institution. The latter can be as simple, especially in the South, as access to

Southeastern Conference football at Georgia. These institutions also offer more diverse academic programs, with degrees in areas like engineering. Such advantages can also entail the low faculty to student ratio and generous staffing in areas like students affairs that leading liberal arts colleges can provide, given available resources. Because enrolling – and, to some extent, retaining – accomplished students is primary in determining prestige at selective institutions, making the institution more attractive to these prospective students is paramount in determining strategy. Institutions thus focus on what they perceive most appeals to these students, enhancing their collegiate character and developing attractive academic programs.

Research universities concentrate additionally on building endowment and developing research, as not just admissions and retention numbers influence national reputation. Including Georgia Tech, Georgia, Georgia State, and the Medical College of Georgia, research universities continue to hire noteworthy faculty and invest in needed infrastructure to building their research programs, including buildings but also staff. Universities and colleges across types are also building academic programs to further their aspirations. Toward attracting more desirable students, institutions are launching or augmenting popular undergraduate majors and graduate programs, encouraging faculty research, emphasizing honors programs and undergraduate research, and enhancing study abroad opportunities (Kirp, 2003; Geiger, 2004). In positioning for greater prestige, advancement in student numbers is more readily achievable than is progress in endowment or research. Georgia State, Georgia Southern, and Georgia College, for instance, each increased its average SAT to around 1,100, enough to put them near the top of institutions of their type.

Despite these different ways of positioning, the strategies, both collegiate and academic, that institutions have available to actually position in such ways are relatively limited and tend to be generic across institutions both within a sector and across types. In admissions, institutions across types have professionalized and expanded student recruiting as an initial matter. In order to appeal to the accomplished prospective students they hope to attract, universities and colleges have also launched or enhanced innovative or unusual academic programs, study abroad opportunities, service learning efforts, honors options, and undergraduate research initiatives.

They are also concentrating more on marketing. Georgia Southern, for instance, is advertising aggressively in suburban Atlanta, including larger banners at upscale shopping malls.

Institutions are also seeking advantage in attracting the students (and faculty and administrators) they desire by updating the infrastructure devoted to collegiate life. Necessities such as dormitories, dining halls, and gymnasiums have become amenities – luxury apartments, upscale food courts, and deluxe fitness centers. Universities and colleges are in a construction arms race, competing with one another. Georgia Tech, for instance, has recently completed a spectacular fitness center on the site of the former Olympic swimming pool. It addressed the dearth of a shopping district adjacent to campus earlier in the decade by constructing storefronts below its new business school and conference center and hotel facility across I-75 from the main campus. Institutions are also constructing academic buildings, especially science buildings, in another arms race. There is also some attention to “amenities” for broader community, such as the museum and performing arts complex at UGA. (Georgia Perimeter, a community college, views amenities differently, focusing more on initiatives such as equipping classrooms with technology.)

Several universities and colleges are engaged in similar efforts in intercollegiate athletics, improving facilities, “upgrading” to Division I, and seeking entry into better conferences as they position themselves for greater prestige (Toma, 2003; Toma, 2009). Georgia State, responding to student demand for a critical marker of a “real” American university, voted to tax themselves \$85 per semester to launch a football team to compete at the Division I-AA level (now called the Football Championship Subdivision). (They also voted for a fee increase to fund a library renovation.) Savannah State has also moved to compete in Division I.²

American institutions have, of course, long expressed their ambitions through constructing impressive campuses and developing football programs, differentiating themselves more readily via facilities and athletics than is really possible through academic programs

² Troy University in Alabama, which is heavily involved in distance education, has built a Division I-A (Football Bowl Subdivision) football program of some note to provide its students around the world with a collegiate touchstone. LaGrange College, which is also enhancing its library, added Division III football recently intending to enhance both student recruitment and in alumni and community relations. Both were part of our broader study on institutional aspirations.

(Gumprecht, 2008; Toma, 2003). They must now, they believe, make these investments to keep pace or avoid falling back in the race for prestige and resources, the two thought to be linked (Brewer, Gates, and Goldman, 2002). If nothing else, the energy here is impressive, even though it is commonly at the peripheries of institutions, as the traditional academic core continues to contract. There are legitimate concerns with positioning for prestige, as with concentrating more on enrolling affluent students than on providing access to those across society.

Also, having devoted themselves to advancing, institutions must make a plausible case that they are doing so. As aspiring institutions tend to be selective, even if some only barely, positive enrollment trends are particularly useful. Establishing satisfactory measurements of institutional progress is challenging, with institutions and others left with such simplistic metrics as the average test scores of incoming students, or retention and graduation rates. But annual increases in SAT or ACT scores are, at least, concrete – and they are commonly accepted as evidence of movement in institutional prestige. At institutions where other available indicators, namely research activity and endowment amount, are not much of a factor, student characteristics become even more central.

Finally, even at the most "aspirational" of institutions, values still matter. There may be consensus on a campus about "getting to the next level," but faculty and others typically guard jealously their influence over academic quality.

Reductions. Potentially influencing both aspirations and quality are significant reductions in state appropriated funds. The discussion below considers the 35 USG institutions by type: research universities, regional universities, state universities, state colleges, and two-year colleges, as defined by the state system. We first set the foundation by presenting enrollment and employment statistics, both total for the Georgia public system and by institution type. We then discuss the reductions that the system made and required of institutions, before exploring budget data by the kinds of budget cuts respective types of institutions proposed.

Table 1 shows the difference in the size and scope of USG institutions by the type.

Table 1:

Enrollment and Faculty by Institution Type

	Total	Research Universities	Regional Universities	State Universities	State Colleges	Two Year Colleges
Number of Institutions	35	4	2	13	8	8
Total Enrollment, Fall 2008	283,048	84,822	29,254	90,758	35,010	43,204
Average Undergraduate Enrollment	7,009	15,159	12,858	6,212	4,376	5,401
Average Graduate Enrollment	1,078	6,046	1,769	770	0	0
Average Annual Enrollment Growth, 1999-2008	5.01%	2.27%	2.72%	3.58%	7.09%	7.46%
Average Faculty Size	273	1022	503	213	115	98
Average Other Instructional (Part-time, Adjunct, etc.)	60	308	101	30	11	21
Average Staff Size	865	4833	996	464	179	188
Average Student-to-Faculty Ratio	36.1	18.8	28.8	31.7	37.9	51.8

Table 1 indicates the great diversity of the University System of Georgia, ranging from world-class research universities to tiny, rural community colleges. The 283,048 students enrolled in the 35 USG institutions in Fall, 2008 ranged from 34,180 students at the University of Georgia to 936 students at one of the two-year colleges. The research universities have a significant graduate student enrollment, averaging nearly one-third of all students enrolled. In addition, the average institutional growth rate has varied significantly among institutions, with the state colleges and two-year sector experiencing over seven percent annual growth since 1999, while the research universities have increased by 2.27 percent.

The state of Georgia has increased in population, with 9.7 million people in 2008, up from 8.2 million in 2000. UGA and Georgia Tech are consciously not increasing in undergraduate enrollment, leaving the other institutions in the state to accommodate increased enrollment demand. Similarly, the research universities, not surprisingly, employ the greatest number of faculty and have the lowest student-to-faculty ratio, well more than one-half that than the two-year colleges. Teaching loads are lower at the research universities, given the expectation that faculty there do research. Also, the complexity of these institutions tends to cause them to have more

staff than universities and colleges of other types.

The severe downturn in the economy in 2008 and resulting state government revenue shortfalls necessitated mid-year budget cutbacks at public universities and colleges. The state provides approximately 42 percent of the University System of Georgia budget, with that figure lower at the research universities and higher at more teaching focused institutions. In August, 2008, it required that USG reduce its original 2009 fiscal year budget of \$21.2 billion by six percent, mandating an additional two percent reduction in December, 2008. The Regents made several system-wide reductions, including reducing employer contribution rates for PPO and HMO health insurance plans from 75 percent to 70 percent, increasing employee contributions accordingly. The system also implemented mandatory student fees, varying depending on the institution type, with research universities at \$100 per semester, regional universities at \$75, and others at \$50.

In August, 2009, the USG again asked institutions to prepare reduction plans including three levels of cuts – four percent, six percent, and eight percent – to the state-funded portion of their budgets along with impact statements, for consideration by the Regents. The Regents ultimately mandated six percent reductions at all institutions. Across the system, the USG instituted a six mandatory furlough days for all employees making over \$23,660, resulting in approximately a three percent pay cut. During the FY 2008 cutbacks, the university did not employ furlough days, though other state agencies were subject to them. The USG also made changes to health insurance plans, eliminating the indemnity option and encouraging employees to switch to high deductible policies. The furloughs and insurance changes reduced the budget by four percent.

The USG instructed all 35 universities and colleges to prepare budget reduction plans, essentially for the two percent remaining to make the six percent cuts overall. Again, these came after reductions totaling eight percent in the previous fiscal year. Institutions were responsible for determining the best ways to reduce their budgets, including the leeway to impose additional furlough days. Table 2 presents the aggregated institutional budget data by type of institution.

Table 2:
Budget by Institute Type

	Total	Research Universities	Regional Universities	State Universities	State Colleges	Two Year Colleges
Average Institutional Budget, FY 2010	\$162,837,681	856,828,668	211,639,464	91,596,534	41,189,050	39,341,026
Average Real Budget Growth, FY 2008 to FY 2010, with Budget Cuts Included (in 2007 Dollars)	14.54%	4.48%	13.56%	10.75%	16.84%	12.21%
Average Percentage of Budget from Annual State Appropriation	42.0%	31.8%	45.8%	43.1%	46.44%	40.15%
Average Endowment per Institution	\$106,773,807	721,616,025	40,838,903	18,741,214	12,133,728	2,654,848
Average Dollar Cut per Student, 4% level	\$301	967	220	219	269	152
Average Dollar Cut per Student, 6% level	\$433	1392	315	316	387	219
Average Dollar Cut per Student, 8% level	\$530	1709	383	387	473	266
Average Federal Stimulus Dollars per Institution	\$2,646,226	12,538,222	3,756,896	1,672,044	805,356	846,475

The average institutional budget for FY 2010 is \$162.8 million, with a wide range between research universities at \$858.8 million and state colleges and two-year colleges closer to \$40 million. Between FY 2008 and FY 2010, the average real growth in the budgets was 14.54 percent within the system, higher than the average annual student enrollment growth rate of 5.01 percent. Research universities have relatively large budgets, averaging \$856.8 million. But they have increased at a relatively modest rate of 2.27 percent, about the same as enrollment growth, which was 2.76 percent. Other types of institutions have experienced more impressive increases. Between FY 2008 and 2010, state colleges have had an average real growth rate in their budgets of 16.84 percent, while there was an average annual growth in student enrollment of 7.1 percent. As noted, USG institutions average receiving 42 percent of their budgets from the state, with research universities closer to 32 percent, given their more diversified sources of revenue,

including from fund raising and funded research. In cutting their budgets, the research universities thus had to cut far more per student than the other institution types – roughly four or five times more – with stimulus money helping institutions of different types about the same.

After complying with the mandate to impose six furlough days, reduce health care program expenses, and increase student fees, where institutions made reductions was at their discretion. We are interested in whether these cuts, again amounting to about two percent of the state appropriated budget, differed by institution type, given differences in missions and aspirations. Table 3 summarizes the budget reduction plans for the 35 institutions at the three requested possible reduction levels, including the six percent one that the Regents ultimately adopted.

Table 3:
Proposed Actions by Institutions to Reduce Budget
at Mandatory 4, 6, and 8 Percent Levels

Proposed Action	4%	6%	8%	Total
Mandatory Six Day Furlough				35
Mandatory Health and Retirement System Rate Increases				35
Eliminate Positions	20	24	18	29
Operating, Equipment, or IT Budget Reductions	21	21	14	29
Travel Budgets Reductions	18	13	10	26
Operating Hours of Services (e.g., Library) Reductions	9	6	5	15
Library Acquisition Budget Reductions	7	7	9	14
Defer Maintenance	5	10	8	13
Student Support Services Reductions (e.g., Tutoring, Retention Programs, Career Services)	7	6	2	12
Marketing or Recruitment Budget reductions	7	7	6	12
Hiring or Filling Positions Delays	7	8	4	11
Restructure, Reorganize, Merge Programs or Departments	6	2	3	9
Across-the-board Budget Cuts	5	7	2	9
Part-Time, Contract, or Temporary Faculty Increases	5	3	2	8
Layoffs	2	3	4	7

Program Expansion Delays	4	2	3	7
Summer School Reductions or Restrictions	5		2	7
Use Auxiliary or Athletic Funds	1	2	6	7
Course Reductions or Elimination	4	2	2	6
Reduce State Funded Initiative (SFI) Budgets	4	5	3	6
Part-Time, Contract, or Temporary Workers Reductions	3	3	2	5
Contingency Funds (Carry Forward Savings or Funds)	5	5	2	5
Investment Income	2	1	3	5
Additional Furlough days	1	2	3	4
Program Reductions or Elimination	2	1	1	4
Financial Management (e.g. Passing Credit Card Fees to Users)	2		2	4
Promote or Increase High-Deductible Enrollment in Health Plan	4			4
Efficiency savings or Process Improvements	2	1	2	4
Replace Senior faculty with Junior, Contract, Shared or Part-Time Faculty	2		1	3
User Fees - New or Increased Fees	1	3	2	3
Close Centers	1		2	3
Administrative Services Reductions or Restrictions	1	1		2
Replace Security Services with Electronic Monitoring	1		1	2
Research Consortium Budget Decrease	2	1	1	2
Reduce Teaching and Learning Support	1	1	1	2
Eliminate Departments	1			1
Utility Savings through Changes to Climate Controls		1		1
Redirect Salaries to Non-State Funded Accounts (e.g., Tuition and Grants)	1			1
Reduce Fringe Benefits for SFI	1	1	1	1
Reduce or Eliminate Rentals or Leases	1	1	1	1
Redirect Salaries to Non-State Funded Accounts		1	1	1
Implementation of Sallie Mae Tuition Pay		1		1
Reduce Supplement Health Insurance for Graduate Students		1		1
Reduce Quality Improvement Programs			1	1

Eliminate Telephone Services			1	1
------------------------------	--	--	---	---

To reach the last two percent of the six percent budget reduction mandated, most institutions choose to reduce employment costs, recognizing that these comprise a substantial component of budgets in higher education. Twenty-nine of the 35 universities or colleges choose to eliminate positions, typically doing so by not filling vacated positions, whether through retirement or voluntary departure. Seven institutions decided to layoff people. Eleven USG universities or colleges temporarily delayed replacing members of the faculty and staff in order to absorb compensation dollars. Several institutions planned to replace more expensive senior faculty members who leave voluntarily with more cheaper junior, contract, shared, or part-time faculty members. Eight institutions planned to increase the use of part-time, contract, or temporary faculty members.

Facility costs are also a large budget item for higher education institutions, and thus a logical area for budget cuts. Twenty-nine universities or colleges cut their operating, equipment, or information technology budgets. Thirteen choose to defer maintenance. Fifteen institutions reduced facility hours, saving utility and operating costs. In theory, many of the actions taken by universities during budget cutbacks are done to avoid employee opposition and conflict (Hardy, 1996). Facility cuts may be appealing here, given they have less of a direct impact than do furloughs. However, substantial budget cuts, as here, can require difficult decisions. And rather than making thoughtful strategic choices, institutions are often forced to quickly make unpopular cuts.

Since phasing out programs or reducing faculty takes time, cutting budgets in the short-term usually necessitates reducing the operating budget, which does not typically include personnel, but instead is comprised of items required for day-to-day operations, such as stationary, printing, travel, contracts, and equipment leases (Rubin, 1980). Twenty-six institutions reduced travel budgets. Such cuts are more symbolic, as travel is a relative modest portion of the overall budget. Some institutions were able to cushion the extent of the cutbacks through good financial management. Five institutions held contingency funds carried over from previous years

in anticipation of cutbacks, and some can use investment income or auxiliary funds to offset reductions. Others instituted new user fees or began passing on charges that were previously absorbed, such as credit card user fees. Nine simply imposed across-the-board cuts.

Despite the difficulties of restructuring and reorganizing programs or departments, several institutions have made such reductions. Like cuts in personnel and facilities, these may have an impact upon their longer-term positioning and strategies. Nine institutions have chosen to restructure or merge programs or departments to reduce costs. Seven institutions are delaying planned program expansions or restricting summer school courses offerings or schedules. Fourteen institutions choose to reduce their library acquisition budgets.

Table 4 summarizes the differences among institution types in the types of cuts they made as a percentage of their budget. The USG provided the institutions with a list of all possible areas to cut and asked them to check off those they would employ, including the amount of the reduction proposed in that category. Here, we grouped the USG categories into nine areas: personnel, instructional, facilities and equipment, faculty and research support, financial management, across-the-board cuts, students support and recruitment, reallocation of state funded activity to other accounts, and efficiency savings and process improvement. In doing so, we come as close as possible in addressing our primary research question: How are institutional aspirations and strategies toward attempting to realize them reflected in the budget cuts?

Table 4:
Average Percentage of Budget
Cuts by Category and Institution Type

Budget Category	Research Universities	Regional Universities	State Universities	State Colleges	Two Year Colleges
Personnel	78.6%	85.1%	56.9%	61.2%	62.4%
Instructional	3.0%	3.9%	4.1%	8.8%	1.5%
Facilities and Equipment	7.3%	4.1%	20.5%	15.1%	17.7%
Faculty and Research Support	3.8%	6.2%	3.3%	6.9%	5.2%
Financial Management	4.4%		5.9%	7.1%	8.6%
Across-the-Board Cuts			2.0%		

Student Support and Recruitment	0.9%	0.7%	1.5%	0.8%	3.0%
Reallocation of State Funded Activity to Other Accounts			4.5%		1.0%
Efficiency Savings or Process Improvements	1.9%		1.3%		0.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Personnel expenses comprise the largest portion of the budget at most higher education institutions, so it is not unexpected that the area would take a large portion of any budget cuts across USG institution types. Possibilities for these reductions include faculty and staff furloughs, eliminating positions, layoffs, and reducing benefits.³ Research and regional universities proposed the largest of their budget cuts in personnel category, thus concentrating reductions here – 78.6 percent and 85.1 percent, respectively. The other institution types – state universities, state colleges, and two-year colleges – have much smaller budgets, spreading reductions more across areas, and averaging around 60 percent in personnel budgets. The other primary difference between the six research and regional universities and other institution types is in facilities, with the former proposing single digit reductions, as opposed to cuts in the 15-20 percent range. Possibilities in facilities and equipment cuts include: deferring maintenance, reducing equipment or IT budgets, and reducing operating hours or services.

Research and regional universities employ facilities strategically, including in advancing research and attracting the most accomplished students. The look and feel of a national or regional campus is important in the latter. Even with the recent expansion of recruitment at state

³ Again referring to Table 4, possibilities for instructional cuts include: program delays, summer school restrictions, reduced course and program offerings, merging departments, and closing educational centers. Faculty and research support cuts can include: travel budgets, library acquisitions, and teaching and research support. Across-the-board cuts are overall reductions to each department or to institution-wide programs, such as institutional research or quality improvement programs. Student support and recruitment reductions can include reducing student support services – such as tutoring, retention programs, career services, and initiation or orientation programs – as well as reductions to marketing or recruitment budgets. The reallocation to other accounts of state funded personnel and programs involve transferring line items from state-appropriated portions of institutional budget to non-state-supported areas. Finally, efficiency savings or process improvements are efficiencies identified or expected by the institution.

universities and state colleges, local institutions rely primarily on proximity in attracting students. But speculating here is uncertain, at best. Only qualitative data is likely to get to motive, really connecting budget cuts with institutional aspirations. It is also interesting to consider how these more local institutions focus predominantly or exclusively on the instruction mission. While relying less on personnel cuts, the state colleges proposed more reductions to instructional activities and student support (8.8 percent) than did institutions of other types. Such cuts suggest the limited options before the USG institutions, as they are related in such a direct manner to mission. Two-year colleges made the least cuts in this area among the different types of institutions, proposing only 1.5 percent reductions. Again, these might be productive areas to explore qualitatively – did institutions most removed from the reputation arms race more fully consider mission in making budget cuts or were the reductions so severe that they had no choice, as with the state colleges, but to cut in areas such as instruction?

State universities, state colleges, and two-year colleges also made more use of financial management than did research and regional universities. Possibilities for financial management cuts include: using contingency funds built up during other years, charging new user fees, using auxiliary or athletic income, or implementing new financial management or accounting procedures. Such results are perhaps surprising, as universities have greater depth in personnel responsible for finance and administration. But the explanation may be that the user fees or accounting techniques proposed are already in place at research and regional universities. It may also be, especially in Georgia, where tuition is quite low relative to other state flagships, institutions like Georgia and Georgia Tech can support higher fees. Furthermore, most institutions do not expect to realize efficiency gains. Of the few institutions that do, there is an expectation of being able to get at least 5 percent of budget reductions through savings realized by process improvements and efficiencies, though these are never explicitly identified.

Furthermore, across all 35 institutions, the average dollar cut proposed per student is \$530 with the expected 8 percent cut. However, this ranges from a high of \$1,709 at research universities to a low of \$266 at two-year colleges. It is \$383 at regional universities, \$387 at state universities, and \$473 at state colleges. Thus, the impact of the reductions on students may be

different at the different types of institutions, with those at the research universities feeling the brunt of it. The fact that research universities can mitigate such impacts through raising funds other than those appropriated by the state may prove helpful here.

Similarly, not all of the cuts will impact the institutions or their aspirations the same. For instance, four institutions have proposed additional furlough days, further reducing salaries. While most employees will absorb the cuts, more mobile employees may be encouraged to seek alternative employment, causing a loss of talent at the institution. Unfortunately, these effects of these actions are generally realized over the longer-term and thus are more difficult to directly connect to the cuts. Nevertheless, they undermine the prestige and aspiration of the institutions in the long run. Prestige is typically associated with customer expectations and perceptions of high-quality service (Brewer et al, 2002). It is not necessarily tangible or definable, but it is certainly real.

Finally, there is variation among institutions within particular classification. This suggests that management, leadership, and discretion influence in how universities and colleges make reductions and their impact on an institution. For instance, two-year colleges make an average of 62.4 percent of their cuts in personnel, ranging from a low of 33.4 percent to a high of 100 percent. In other words, institutions make and mitigate the impact of the budget cuts in different ways, even given the common core values established by the Board of Regents for each type of institution.

Conclusions and Implications

We find some, but quite limited, given the nature of the quantitative data available, support for the proposition that institutions are making cuts strategically – reducing spending in alignment with their stated broad aspirations. Institutions are cutting the state-supported component of their budgets primarily through furloughs, eliminating positions, layoffs, and reducing benefits. They are also, more symbolically, reducing discretionary operating expenses, such as faculty travel and library subscriptions, and more local institutions are also proposing reductions in facilities and equipment. There are differences between institution types, with personnel being around 80

percent of cuts at the six research and regional universities with limited facilities cuts, while the mix is more like 60-15 or 60-20 between personnel and facilities at other institution types. The financial data are only suggestive in addressing our research question of how institutional aspirations and strategies toward attempting to realize them are reflected in the budget cuts. But these data inform going into the field and inquiring through interviews about motives in submitting budget reduction plans.

Personnel cuts are often not, by nature, strategic. Furloughs are essentially to across-the-board cuts, with institutions applying them to all faculty and staff. Unfilled positions are based on chance – someone retiring or leaving for another institution – rather than on strategic planning or program assessments. Even though institutions routinely generate applicable data through institutional research offices and institutional effectiveness efforts, including as charged to do so by state and other accountability initiatives, the personnel reductions suggest that they do not appear to be employing it in making decisions. So, institutions, in concentrating reductions in personnel – again, in the 80 percent range at the largest institutions – are not taking advantage of opportunities for "right sizing," but instead simply cutting based on convenience. It would be interesting to know whether with the few faculty hires they are making, if institutions across types are focusing on academic areas that they have been building. Additionally, with another cycle of budget cutback looming in FY 2011, institutions are likely going to have to consider layoffs, but have thus far stressed protecting employees, both those administrative positions. Also, with reductions in full-time faculty, the instructional load is shifting from permanent faculty to temporary instructors, including graduate assistants at research universities, consistent with national trends (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2005). Furthermore, as institutions have slowed all hiring, are research universities, especially, less able to make the noteworthy faculty hires that are so central to advancing institutional aspirations?

Institutions do not appear, at least to the extent we can discern from the financial data, to have scaled back their aggressive recruitment of the most accomplished students, reducing student support and recruiting by around only one percent (three percent in the two-year sector). The entering characteristics of undergraduate students are a prominent variable in most

institutional ranking schemes, as is endowment size and research funding. Georgia institutions have an advantage here in that tuition is free through the HOPE scholarship program for entering students who earn a B average or better in high school. But will the economic slowdown reduce the state lottery revenues that fund HOPE? HOPE has contributed to the robust competition for accomplished students among Georgia institutions, providing them with a significant advantage over private and out-of-state options. It is reasonable to speculate that institutions across Georgia, interested as they are in increasing their reputation, will continue to build facilities associated with attracting students, such as residence halls and student centers. These have a revenue stream and can be financed apart from the state budget through either debt or student fees. Similarly, institutions focused on accomplished students may well feel compelled to continue to construct instructional and research facilities, not wanting to slow progress either in student recruiting or research capacity, both of which they see as drivers of prestige and resources (Ehrenberg, 2002; Geiger, 2004).

Furthermore, a significant challenge, particularly at the Georgia research universities, is in the severe decline in endowment income, with several of the funds that support specific faculty or scholarships "upside down." Universities and colleges are appealing for new private funds simply to replace these lost endowment payouts, which is hardly advancing the common institutional ambition of growing endowments. Especially given the severe decline in endowment income, will the market for noteworthy faculty be less robust? Once again, with the hires that they do make, will universities and colleges focus on the academic areas that they have been building, thus acting more strategically than across-the-board cuts in discretionary spending? Will construction spending, especially on projects such as residences that have a revenue stream attached, continue at its current pace? Finally, will wealthier, more prestigious institutions suffer less – or more – especially given their reliance on endowment income?

Georgia institutions have only been able to raise tuition somewhat, given that doing so passes along some costs to the state, which funds HOPE. The \$100 emergency fee, apart from HOPE, charged by the four research universities in the Spring, 2009 semester, is an illustration of just how little is possible. Institutions are also tapping into auxiliary services in their attempt to

overcome budget shortfalls, asking areas such as housing and even athletics (at the University of Georgia where the program runs a surplus) to contribute to the general fund. Some investments apart from state appropriations continue. Athletics is an interesting illustration, with private support enabling growth, as with a new Division I football program at Georgia State. But there are cutbacks in annual subsidies to athletics by institutions, paralleling (but not exceeding, as yet) those across campus. Another alternative revenue source, fund raising, has been a particular challenge, with donors less able and willing to give during a weak economy and various endowed funds without the proceeds to cover them. Still, the public universities in Georgia have not experienced budget crises to the same degree as at the elite private research universities, who have taken loans of sometimes \$1 billion to meet budget obligations previously covered by endowment income. (One lesson of the recent months is that relying on endowment payout to cover regular operating expenses, including in instruction, can be perilous.)

Assuming that public universities and colleges in Georgia are not backing away from their aspirations, particularly the pursuit of more accomplished students at leading institutions, a disturbing question arises. Are they offering those they recruit a diminished product, as instructional budgets decline, moving increasingly away from having faculty in tenure significant positions in undergraduate classrooms? Is there a tipping point here, where institutional strategies toward increasing temporary faculty that have only accelerated with the financial crisis have an impact on institutional prestige? Instruction is pretty much a black box for prospective students and their parents, who are usually unaware of specifics related to who is teaching a given course. But the cutbacks have predominantly come from instruction, if factoring in instructional personnel – and ten percent annual cutbacks can take their toll (as the experience in Florida over the past few years demonstrates). Also, at a certain point, leading faculty begin to consider their options, further diminishing the capacity of a university or college.

Perhaps most disappointing, but not surprising, really, is that institutions are not using the budget crisis to enhance efficiency. For instance, administrative positions in higher education have increased dramatically over the past three decades, but the idea of "right sizing" here does not appear to be on the table, given layoffs have not been used except at a handful of institutions.

(In contrast, Emory University, a private, has had several rounds of layoffs.) Funding reductions, ideally, would be carefully considered, supported by the voluminous data that U.S. institutions regularly collect, with low-priority or less effective positions and programs downsized or abolished (Levine and Rubin, 1980). That Georgia institutions are resorting to across-the-board cutbacks, in effect, may be attributable to the rapidity with which the recession came, putting states and institutions into reactive mode. Although, fiscal crises are common in higher education (Birnbaum and Shushok, 2001), few saw the present global economic crisis coming.

But the response is also connected with the unwillingness of administrators to make hard decisions, and that institutional effectiveness efforts are often more about complying with paperwork requirements and less about supporting decisions, including strategic ones. Similarly, strategic plans are rarely so robust that institutions turn to them to guide decisions such as those required with the recent budget cutbacks. Will the budget crisis prompt institutions to reconsider their visions from, almost reflexively, seeking to "move to the next level" toward more realistic and broadly productive strategic directions? Are institutions allocating resources to these positioning initiatives and perhaps away from other important institutional commitments? The greatest opportunities for significant change often come during crisis. Thus far, USG institutions are not realizing the unusual chances before them.

References

- Behn, R. D. (1985). Cutback budgeting. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management*, 4(2),155-77.
- Birnbaum, R. and F. Shushok (2001). The 'crisis' crisis in higher education: Is that a wolf or a pussycat at the academy's door?" In P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumpert and D. B. Johnstone (eds.), *In Defense of American Higher Education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bok, D. C. (2002). *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bozeman, B. and J. D. Straussman (1982). Shrinking budgets and the shrinkage of budget theory. *Public Administration Review*, 42(6), 509-15.

- Bozeman, B. and E. A. Slusher (1979). Scarcity and environmental stress in public Organizations: A Conjectural Essay. *Administration and Society*, 11(Nov), 335-56.
- Brewer, D., S. M. Gates, and C. A. Goldman (2002). In Pursuit of Prestige: Strategy and Competition in U.S. Higher Education. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J. and W. W. Powell (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48,147-60.
- Dutton, J. E., J. M. Dukerich, and C. V. Harquail (1994). Organizational images and member identification." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 239-63.
- Ehrenberg, R. (2002). *Tuition Rising: Why College Costs So Much*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Geiger, R. (2004). *Knowledge and Money: Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Glaser, B. and A. Strauss (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Adline.
- Gumprecht, B. (2007). *The American College Town*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Kaufman, H. (1971). *The Limits of Organizational Change*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
- Kirp, D. (2003). *Shakespeare, Einstein, and the Bottom Line: The Marketing of Higher Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lauth, T. P. (1994). Reductions in the FY 1992 Georgia budget: Responses to a revenue shortfall. In A. Khan and W. B. Hildreth (eds.), *Case Studies in Public Budgeting and Financial Management* (pp. 221-248). Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Levine, C. H. (1978). Organizational decline and cutback management. *Public Administration review*, 38(4), 316-25.
- Levine, C. H. and I. S. Rubin (1980). Economic growth, decline, and policy change. In C. H. Levine and I. Rubin (eds.), *Fiscal Stress and Public Policy* (pp: 113-34). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Marginson, S. (2006). Enabling democratic education in the neoliberal age. *Educational Theory*, 56(2), 205-19.
- Marshall, C. and G. R. Rossman (1999). *Designing Qualitative Research*, 3d Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mingle, J. (1981). Challenges of retrenchment. In J. Mingle (ed.), *Challenges of Retrenchment: Strategies for Consolidating Programs, Cutting Costs, and Reallocating Resources*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Nakamura, R. T. and F. Smallwood (1980). *The Politics of Policy Implementation*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Pfeffer, J. (1982). *Organizations and Organization Theory*. Marshfield, MA: Pitman.
- Pfeffer, J. and G. R. Salancik (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Rein, M. and F. F. Rabinovitz (1978). Implementation: A theoretical perspective. In W. D. Burnham and M. W. Weinberg (eds.), *American Politics and Public Policy*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Schick, A. (1980). Budgetary adaptations to resource scarcity. In C. H. Levine and I. Rubin (eds.), *Fiscal Stress and Public Policy* (pp: 113-134). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Shattock, M. (2003). *Managing Successful Universities*. Bristol, PA: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- Slaughter, S. and G. Rhoades (2004). *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Starbuck, W., A. Greve, and L.T. Hedberg (1978). Responding to Crisis. *Journal of Business Administration*, 9(June), 111-137.
- Toma, J. D. (2003). *Football U.: Spectator Sports in the Life of the American University*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Toma, J. D. (2009b). The business of intercollegiate athletics. In D. Siegel and J. Knapp (Eds.), *The Business of Higher Education*. New York: Praeger.
- Toma, J. D. (November 2008). Positioning for prestige in American higher education: Case studies of strategies at four public institutions toward "getting to the next level." Paper presented at the Association for Research on Higher Education (ASHE) Annual Meeting, Jacksonville, Florida.
- Toma, J. D. (September 2009a). Why U.S. universities and colleges are positioning for prestige: Legitimacy and differentiation in the Atlanta market. Paper presented at the Consortium for Higher Education Research (CHER) Annual Meeting, Porto, Portugal.
- Toma, J. D., G. Dubrow, and J. M. Hartley (2005). *The Uses of Institutional Culture: Strengthening Identification and Building Brand Equity in Higher Education*. ASHE Higher Education Reports, 31(3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Treacy, M. and F. Wiersema (1995). *The Discipline of Market Leaders*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Volkwein, J. F. and K. V. Sweitzer (2006). Institutional prestige and reputation among research universities and liberal arts college." *Research in Higher Education*, 47(2), 129-148.
- Weisbrod, B. A., et al. (2008). *Mission and Money: Understanding the University*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Whetten, D. A. (1980). Organizational decline: A neglected topic in organizational science. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(Oct), 577-588.
- Whetten, D. A. (1981). Organizational responses to scarcity: Exploring the obstacles to innovative approaches to retrenchment in education." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 17(3), 80-97
- Willoughby, K. G. and T. P. Lauth (2003). Cutback management in Georgia: State agency responses to fiscal year 1992 budget reductions." In A. Khan and W. B. Hildreth (eds.), *Case Studies in Public Budgeting and Financial Management*, 2d ed. (pp: 377-92). New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.

Wotherspoon, T. (1991). *Hitting the Books: The Politics of Educational Retrenchment*. Toronto: Garamond.

Zemsky, R., G. R. Wegner, and W. F. Massy (2005). *Remaking The American University: Market-Smart And Mission-Centered*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Appendix A

Summary of Interview Questions

In the interviews with the presidents, we began each by asking about the aspirations for the institution he or she has defined and regularly articulates. We then explored how important it is for the institution to be perceived to be moving toward greater prestige; what are its points of reference relative to prestige; and how aware the presidents and campuses generally are of what is going on at their peer and aspirational institutions, as well as with their local competitors. We also questioned the presidents about what constitutes prestige at an institution such as theirs; what various constituents perceive that enhanced prestige brings to an institution; and how readily they can express their aspirations for the institution to various audiences, both internal and external. Having explored ambitions, we moved to strategies, asking what moves the institution has made on its academic side to enhance prestige, such as attracting notable faculty and more accomplished students,⁴ suggesting several more specific possibilities: (1) launching or enhancing honors programs, innovative or unusual academic programs, study abroad programs, and service learning efforts; (2) expanding graduate education and increasing research, including grants and contracts, and developing centers and institutes or moving into “cutting edge” academic fields, especially interdisciplinary ones; (3) investing in university presses, national conferences, international initiatives, and the like; (4) entering into consortia with other institutions. We also asked the presidents to discuss strategies they are employing on the “collegiate” side of the university or college, such as enhancing campus amenities like housing, dining, fitness, and shopping – and how athletics serves these strategic ends.

Finally, we shifted to broader insights, asking each president about what strategies his or her institution has had the most success with; how they measure such success and whether these measures are satisfying; whether their strategic approach has served to differentiate the institution from others, particularly competitors or aspirational institutions, or if their institution has become more like others; and what the risks are of positioning for prestige, including increased

⁴ The primary variables in prestige rankings are typically: (1) an institution’s selectivity in enrolling its freshman class each year and its retention and graduation rates; (2) its fundraising strength, measured by annual totals and its endowment; and (3) its research funding, particularly federal grants.

external control, need for funds, alienation for traditional constituencies, and, ultimately, overall expectations. We concluded by asking why he or she thinks positioning for prestige is such a necessity – an obsession, really – across much of American higher education; whether it is realistic to opt out, saying, in effect, “we are doing fine and should relax;” whether, if there are winners in the pursuit of prestige, must there be losers; and whether positioning for prestige is not only inevitable, but also advantageous, making U.S. higher education and individual institutions more dynamic.⁵

⁵ The interview protocol evolved, though not markedly, from the beginning of the campus visits to the end – a roughly four-month period. Given we began analyzing the data as we were collecting it, the final interview protocol approximates the categories we use in organizing our findings.

1	Mandatory six day furlough	35		35
39	Health and TRS Rate Increases	35		35
3	Eliminate positions	20	24	18
19	Operating, equipment or IT budget reductions	21	21	14
16	Travel budgets reductions	18	13	10
21	Operating hours of services (e.g., library) reductions	9	6	5
17	Library acquisition budget reductions	7	7	9
18	Defer maintenance	5	10	8
23	Student support services reductions (e.g., tutoring, retention program)	7	6	2
29	Marketing or recruitment budget reductions	7	7	6
4	Hiring or filling positions delays	7	8	4
14	Restructure, reorganize, merge of programs or departments	6	2	3
32	Across-the-board budget cuts	5	7	2
7	Part-time, contract, or temporary faculty increases	5	3	2
8	Layoffs	4	3	4
9	Program expansion delays	4	2	3
11	Summer School reductions or restrictions	5	2	7
30	Auxiliary or athletic funds	1	2	6
13	Course reductions or elimination	4	2	2
28	Reduce state funded initiative (SFI) budgets	4	5	3
5	Part-time, contract, or temporary workers reductions	3	3	2
22	Contingency funds (carry forward savings or funds)	5	5	2
31	Investment Income	2	1	3
2	Additional furlough days	1	2	3
12	Program reductions or elimination	2	1	1
20	Financial management (passing credit card fees to users)	2	2	4
24	Health Plan - promote or increase high deductible enrollment	4		4
33	Efficiency savings or Process Improvements	2	1	2
6	Replace senior faculty with junior, contract, shared or part-time faculty	2		1
34	User Fees - new or increased fees	1	3	2
35	Close Centers	1		2
10	Administrative services reductions or restrictions	1	1	2
25	Replace security services with electronic monitoring	1		1
37	Research consortium budget decrease	2	1	1
40	Reduce teaching and learning support	1	1	1
15	Eliminate departments	1		1
26	Utility savings through changes to climate controls	1	1	1
27	Redirect salaries to non-state funded accounts (e.g., tuition and grants)	1		1
36	Reduce fringe benefits for SFI	1	1	1
38	Reduce or eliminate rentals or leases	1	1	1
50	Redirect salaries to non-state funded accounts (e.g., tuition and grants)	1	1	1
51	Implementation of Sallie Mae Tuition Pay	1		1
52	Reduce supplement health insurance for grad students	1		1
60	Reduce quality improvement programs	1		1
61	Eliminate phone services	1		1

			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
			Personnel	Instructional	Equipment - deferring their income or new faculty or research supp	Financial management	Administrations	Across-the-board support or service	Accounting	Efficiency		
20	Georgia Southern University	Regional University	11	6	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
34	Valdosta State University	Regional University	11	5	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
			2	11	5	2	0	2	0	2	0	0
18	Georgia Institute of Technology	Research University	20	6	5	3	2	1	0	2	0	1
22	Georgia State University	Research University	18	6	1	2	2	1	1	2	0	1
26	Medical College of Georgia	Research University	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	University of Georgia	Research University	12	4	2	4	0	1	0	1	0	0
			4	21	9	4	4	1	1	5	0	2
1	Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	State College	12	4	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
8	College of Coastal Georgia	State College	10	4	1	3	0	1	0	1	0	0
10	Dalton State College	State College	13	4	5	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
14	Gainesville State College	State College	9	3	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	0
16	Georgia Gwinnett College	State College	8	3	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
23	Gordon College	State College	7	4	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
25	Macon State College	State College	7	3	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
27	Middle Georgia College	State College	7	3	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
			8	28	15	15	2	5	3	2	3	0
2	Albany State University	State University	5	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
3	Armstrong Atlantic State University	State University	7	3	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
5	Augusta State University	State University	7	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
7	Clayton State University	State University	18	6	3	2	1	1	2	1	2	0
9	Columbus State University	State University	8	4	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
13	Fort Valley State University	State University	11	5	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0
15	Georgia College & State University	State University	16	6	1	4	0	1	0	2	1	0
21	Georgia Southwestern State University	State University	14	8	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0
24	Kennesaw State University	State University	8	3	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0
28	North Georgia College & State University	State University	12	3	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	1
29	Savannah State University	State University	10	3	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1
31	Southern Polytechnic State University	State University	7	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
33	University of West Georgia	State University	17	4	6	3	1	0	2	3	0	0
			13	56	19	22	6	11	6	8	6	2
4	Atlanta Metropolitan College	Two Year College	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	Bainbridge College	Two Year College	11	7	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
11	Darton College	Two Year College	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
12	East Georgia College	Two Year College	10	3	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
17	Georgia Highlands College	Two Year College	7	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
19	Georgia Perimeter College	Two Year College	10	2	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0
30	South Georgia College	Two Year College	13	4	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	0
35	Waycross College	Two Year College	9	3	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
			8	28	5	13	3	6	3	6	1	0

			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
			Personnel	Instructional	Equipment - deferring their income or new faculty or research supp	Financial management	Administrations	Across-the-board support or service	Accounting	Efficiency		
20	Georgia Southern University	Regional University	54.5%	18.2%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
34	Valdosta State University	Regional University	45.5%	27.3%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
18	Georgia Institute of Technology	Research University	30.0%	25.0%	15.0%	10.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	5.0%
22	Georgia State University	Research University	33.3%	5.6%	11.1%	11.1%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	5.6%
26	Medical College of Georgia	Research University	83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
32	University of Georgia	Research University	33.3%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%
1	Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	State College	33.3%	41.7%	8.3%	8.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
8	College of Coastal Georgia	State College	40.0%	10.0%	30.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%
10	Dalton State College	State College	30.8%	38.5%	15.4%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
14	Gainesville State College	State College	33.3%	11.1%	22.2%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
16	Georgia Gwinnett College	State College	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
23	Gordon College	State College	57.1%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
25	Macon State College	State College	42.9%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
27	Middle Georgia College	State College	42.9%	14.3%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
2	Albany State University	State University	60.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
3	Armstrong Atlantic State University	State University	42.9%	14.3%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
5	Augusta State University	State University	57.1%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
7	Clayton State University	State University	33.3%	16.7%	11.1%	5.6%	5.6%	11.1%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
9	Columbus State University	State University	50.0%	12.5%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%
13	Fort Valley State University	State University	45.5%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%
15	Georgia College & State University	State University	37.5%	25.0%	12.5%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%	6.3%	0.0%
21	Georgia Southwestern State University	State University	57.1%	0.0%	14.3%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	7.1%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
24	Kennesaw State University	State University	37.5%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%
28	North Georgia College & State University	State University	25.0%	8.3%	16.7%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%	16.7%	0.0%	8.3%	8.3%
29	Savannah State University	State University	30.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%
31	Southern Polytechnic State University	State University	57.1%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
33	University of West Georgia	State University	23.5%	35.3%	17.6%	5.9%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	0.0%
4	Atlanta Metropolitan College	Two Year College	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
6	Bainbridge College	Two Year College	63.6%	9.1%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
11	Darton College	Two Year College	60.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
12	East Georgia College	Two Year College	30.0%	10.0%	30.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
17	Georgia Highlands College	Two Year College	42.9%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
19	Georgia Perimeter College	Two Year College	20.0%	0.0%	30.0%	20.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
30	South Georgia College	Two Year College	30.8%	7.7%	15.4%	0.0%	7.7%	15.4%	7.7%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%
35	Waycross College	Two Year College	33.3%	22.2%	22.2%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%

Institution	Type of Institution	Total cuts	Personnel	Instructional	Facilities and equipment	Faculty and Research Support	Financial Management	Across-the-Board cuts	Student support or	Reallocation of state funded to other accounts	Efficiency savings or Process Improvements
Georgia Institute of Technology	Research University	\$18,839,740	80.4%	0.5%	8.8%	3.5%	4.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia State University	Research University	\$17,428,686	64.3%	2.9%	4.8%	6.4%	13.7%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	7.6%
Medical College of Georgia	Research University	\$12,912,803	91.2%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
University of Georgia	Research University	\$28,307,692	78.7%	0.0%	15.8%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
			78.6%	3.0%	7.3%	3.8%	4.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	1.9%
Georgia Southern University	Regional University	\$7,038,412	79.2%	5.5%	7.1%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Valdosta State University	Regional University	\$4,256,000	81.0%	2.3%	1.1%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
			85.1%	3.9%	4.1%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Albany State University	State University	\$1,779,925	77.1%	0.0%	20.3%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Armstrong Atlantic State University	State University	\$2,530,157	56.9%	23.9%	11.3%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Augusta State University	State University	\$2,245,234	63.0%	0.0%	22.3%	0.0%	14.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clayton State University	State University	\$2,005,071	45.2%	0.0%	34.9%	4.2%	3.7%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.2%
Columbus State University	State University	\$2,915,200	72.3%	0.0%	19.9%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%
Fort Valley State University	State University	\$1,787,457	40.5%	0.0%	22.9%	20.4%	16.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia College & State University	State University	\$2,666,604	44.2%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	48.8%	0.0%
Georgia Southwestern State University	State University	\$1,005,686	64.3%	0.0%	27.8%	2.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Kennesaw State University	State University	\$6,777,192	54.6%	0.0%	43.1%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
North Georgia College & State University	State University	\$2,052,516	42.5%	0.5%	6.4%	1.2%	14.6%	25.7%	2.7%	1.2%	5.2%
Savannah State University	State University	\$1,570,727	36.1%	10.2%	22.9%	2.8%	12.7%	0.0%	3.2%	0.5%	11.6%
Southern Polytechnic State University	State University	\$1,771,493	81.3%	2.6%	15.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
University of West Georgia	State University	\$3,889,276	62.1%	5.2%	12.5%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%
			56.9%	4.1%	20.5%	3.3%	5.9%	2.0%	1.5%	4.5%	1.3%
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	State College	\$1,137,982	62.5%	13.9%	4.4%	12.6%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
College of Coastal Georgia	State College	\$1,118,494	69.4%	6.7%	20.9%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Darton State College	State College	\$1,144,490	34.6%	25.3%	17.6%	15.5%	5.7%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Gainesville State College	State College	\$1,612,689	54.0%	5.0%	38.1%	1.7%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia Gwinnett College	State College	\$2,685,359	55.4%	5.6%	16.8%	18.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Gordon College	State College	\$958,500	71.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Macon State College	State College	\$1,707,333	64.8%	0.0%	14.6%	3.8%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Middle Georgia College	State College	\$1,465,952	77.3%	14.3%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
			61.2%	8.8%	15.1%	6.9%	7.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Atlanta Metropolitan College	Two Year College	\$853,846	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bainbridge College	Two Year College	\$745,504	72.8%	11.7%	13.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Darton College	Two Year College	\$1,266,849	61.6%	0.0%	38.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
East Georgia College	Two Year College	\$501,724	94.7%	0.0%	13.3%	0.8%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia Highlands College	Two Year College	\$1,161,887	59.8%	0.0%	8.6%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	7.6%	0.0%
Georgia Perimeter College	Two Year College	\$4,744,663	33.7%	0.0%	13.9%	4.2%	46.1%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%
South Georgia College	Two Year College	\$630,404	33.4%	0.0%	22.2%	14.9%	21.6%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	5.6%
Waycross College	Two Year College	\$326,773	62.9%	0.0%	32.0%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%
			62.4%	1.5%	17.7%	5.2%	8.6%	0.0%	3.0%	1.0%	0.7%

Institution	Type of Institution	Total cuts	Personnel	Instructional	Facilities and equipment	Faculty and Research Support	Financial Management	Across-the-Board cuts	Student support or	Reallocation of state funded to other accounts	Efficiency savings or Process Improvements
Totals		Total cuts	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	J
Georgia Institute of Technology	Research University	\$18,839,740	80.4%	0.5%	8.8%	3.5%	4.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia State University	Research University	\$17,428,686	64.3%	2.9%	4.8%	6.4%	13.7%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	7.6%
Medical College of Georgia	Research University	\$12,912,803	91.2%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
University of Georgia	Research University	\$28,307,692	78.7%	0.0%	15.8%	5.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
			78.6%	3.0%	7.3%	3.8%	4.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	1.9%
Georgia Southern University	Regional University	\$7,038,412	79.2%	5.5%	7.1%	8.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Valdosta State University	Regional University	\$4,256,000	81.0%	2.3%	1.1%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
			85.1%	3.9%	4.1%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Albany State University	State University	\$1,779,925	77.1%	0.0%	20.3%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Armstrong Atlantic State University	State University	\$2,530,157	56.9%	23.9%	11.3%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Augusta State University	State University	\$2,245,234	63.0%	0.0%	22.3%	0.0%	14.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clayton State University	State University	\$2,005,071	45.2%	0.0%	34.9%	4.2%	3.7%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.2%
Columbus State University	State University	\$2,915,200	72.3%	0.0%	19.9%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%
Fort Valley State University	State University	\$1,787,457	40.5%	0.0%	22.9%	20.4%	16.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia College & State University	State University	\$2,666,604	44.2%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	48.8%	0.0%
Georgia Southwestern State University	State University	\$1,005,686	64.3%	0.0%	27.8%	2.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Kennesaw State University	State University	\$6,777,192	54.6%	0.0%	43.1%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%
North Georgia College & State University	State University	\$2,052,516	42.5%	0.5%	6.4%	1.2%	14.6%	25.7%	2.7%	1.2%	5.2%
Savannah State University	State University	\$1,570,727	36.1%	10.2%	22.9%	2.8%	12.7%	0.0%	3.2%	0.5%	11.6%
Southern Polytechnic State University	State University	\$1,771,493	81.3%	2.6%	15.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
University of West Georgia	State University	\$3,889,276	62.1%	5.2%	12.5%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%	0.0%	0.0%
			56.9%	4.1%	20.5%	3.3%	5.9%	2.0%	1.5%	4.5%	1.3%
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	State College	\$1,137,982	62.5%	13.9%	4.4%	12.6%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
College of Coastal Georgia	State College	\$1,118,494	69.4%	6.7%	20.9%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Darton State College	State College	\$1,144,490	34.6%	25.3%	17.6%	15.5%	5.7%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Gainesville State College	State College	\$1,612,689	54.0%	5.0%	38.1%	1.7%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia Gwinnett College	State College	\$2,685,359	55.4%	5.6%	16.8%	18.6%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Gordon College	State College	\$958,500	71.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	28.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Macon State College	State College	\$1,707,333	64.8%	0.0%	14.6%	3.8%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Middle Georgia College	State College	\$1,465,952	77.3%	14.3%	8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
			61.2%	8.8%	15.1%	6.9%	7.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Atlanta Metropolitan College	Two Year College	\$853,846	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bainbridge College	Two Year College	\$745,504	72.8%	11.7%	13.4%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Darton College	Two Year College	\$1,266,849	61.6%	0.0%	38.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
East Georgia College	Two Year College	\$501,724	94.7%	0.0%	13.3%	0.8%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia Highlands College	Two Year College	\$1,161,887	59.8%	0.0%	8.6%	8.6%	0.0%	0.0%	15.3%	7.6%	0.0%
Georgia Perimeter College	Two Year College	\$4,744,663	33.7%	0.0%	13.9%	4.2%	46.1%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%
South Georgia College	Two Year College	\$630,404	33.4%	0.0%	22.2%	14.9%	21.6%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	5.6%
Waycross College	Two Year College	\$326,773	62.9%	0.0%	32.0%	10.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%
			62.4%	1.5%	17.7%	5.2%	8.6%	0.0%	3.0%	1.0%	0.7%

Institution	Type of Institution	Total cuts	Personnel	Instructional	Facilities and equipment	Faculty and Research Support	Financial Management	Across-the-Board cuts	Student support or	Reallocation of state funded to other accounts	Efficiency savings or Process Improvements
Totals		Total cuts	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	J
Research University			78.6%	3.0%	7.3%	3.8%	4.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	1.9%
Regional University			85.1%	3.9%	4.1%	6.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
State University			56.9%	4.1%	20.5%	3.3%	5.9%	2.0%	1.5%	4.5%	1.3%
State College			61.2%	8.8%	15.1%	6.9%	7.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Two Year College			62.4%	1.5%	17.7%	5.2%	8.6%	0.0%	3.0%	1.0%	0.7%

Budget Category	Research University	Regional University	State University	State College	Two Year College
Personnel	78.6%	85.1%	56.9%	61.2%	62.4%
Instructional	3.0%	3.9%	4.1%	8.8%	1.5%
Facilities and equipment	7.3%	4.1%	20.5%	15.1%	17.7%
Faculty and Research Support	3.8%	6.2%	3.3%	6.9%	5.2%
Financial Management	4.4%	0.0%	5.9%	7.1%	8.6%
Across-the-Board cuts	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Student support and Recruitment	0.9%	0.7%	1.5%	0.8%	3.0%
Reallocation of state funded activity to other accounts	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	1.0%
Efficiency savings or Process Improvements	1.9%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.7%

Institution	Type of Institution	FY10 Budget	Total cuts	Percentage of total budget	Personnel	Instructional	Facilities and equipment	Faculty and Research Support	Financial Management	Across-the-Board cuts	Student support and Recruitment	Reallocation of state funds to other accounts	Efficiency savings or Process Improvements
Georgia Institute of Technology	Research University	\$1,029,083,667	\$18,839,740	1.8%	1.5%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia State University	Research University	\$616,140,855	\$17,429,596	2.8%	1.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Medical College of Georgia	Research University	\$632,550,307	\$12,912,803	2.0%	1.9%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
University of Georgia	Research University	\$1,149,539,821	\$28,307,692	2.5%	1.8%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
					1.8%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Georgia Southern University	Regional University	\$254,285,433	\$7,038,412	2.8%	2.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Valdosta State University	Regional University	\$168,993,495	\$4,256,000	2.5%	2.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
					2.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Albany State University	State University	\$68,520,234	\$1,779,925	2.6%	2.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Armstrong Atlantic State University	State University	\$81,574,452	\$2,530,157	3.1%	1.8%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Augusta State University	State University	\$69,682,599	\$2,245,234	3.2%	2.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Clayton State University	State University	\$77,160,680	\$2,005,071	2.6%	1.2%	0.3%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Columbus State University	State University	\$92,523,621	\$2,915,200	3.2%	2.3%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%
Fort Valley State University	State University	\$75,871,729	\$1,787,457	2.4%	1.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia College & State University	State University	\$100,853,165	\$2,666,694	2.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%
Georgia Southwestern State University	State University	\$40,152,001	\$1,005,686	2.5%	1.6%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Kennesaw State University	State University	\$246,630,494	\$6,777,192	2.7%	1.5%	0.0%	1.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
North Georgia College & State University	State University	\$70,977,629	\$2,052,516	2.9%	1.2%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Savannah State University	State University	\$66,121,168	\$1,970,727	2.4%	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%
Southern Polytechnic State University	State University	\$62,384,112	\$1,771,493	2.8%	2.3%	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
University of West Georgia	State University	\$138,303,054	\$3,889,276	2.8%	1.7%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%
					1.6%	0.1%	0.6%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	State College	\$37,517,510	\$1,137,982	3.0%	1.9%	0.4%	0.1%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
College of Coastal Georgia	State College	\$29,002,450	\$1,118,494	3.9%	2.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Dalton State College	State College	\$38,328,003	\$1,144,450	3.0%	1.0%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Gainesville State College	State College	\$58,567,349	\$1,612,689	2.8%	1.5%	0.1%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia Gwinnett College	State College	\$43,417,781	\$2,685,359	6.2%	3.4%	0.3%	1.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Gordon College	State College	\$38,868,862	\$956,500	2.5%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Macon State College	State College	\$51,020,967	\$1,707,933	3.3%	2.2%	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Middle Georgia College	State College	\$46,521,162	\$1,465,952	3.2%	2.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
					2.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Atlanta Metropolitan College	Two Year College	\$23,048,501	\$653,846	2.8%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Bainbridge College	Two Year College	\$24,937,274	\$745,504	3.0%	2.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Darton College	Two Year College	\$38,545,413	\$1,266,849	3.3%	2.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
East Georgia College	Two Year College	\$18,224,556	\$501,724	2.8%	2.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Georgia Highlands College	Two Year College	\$29,526,272	\$1,161,887	3.9%	2.4%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%
Georgia Perimeter College	Two Year College	\$150,800,874	\$4,744,863	3.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	1.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
South Georgia College	Two Year College	\$21,352,172	\$630,404	3.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%
Waycross College	Two Year College	\$8,293,142	\$326,773	3.9%	2.1%	0.0%	1.3%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
					3.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%

State appropriate Tuition	Sponsored	Federal Stimulus SFI	Research Conors Revenues	Percent state appropri	Foundations and Comp	Furlough Days 4%	Furlough Days 6%	Furlough Days 8%	Total Furlough svgs	Senior Furlough	Courses 4%	Courses 6%	Courses 8%	Library 4%	Library 6%	Library Acquisitions 8%	Library Savings	Eliminate positions 4%	Eliminate positions 6%	Eliminate positions 8%	Positions svgs	Layoff 4%	Layoff 6%	Layoff 8%	Savings	Travel 4%	Travel 6%	Travel 8%			
14,217,875	5,607,640	6,100,000	765,173	6,899	27,555,087	51.62%	13,454,056	6	340,000.00					5,000.00	15,000.00	25,000.00	45,000.00	4	8	12	1					16,143.00	32,285.00	50,000.00			
21,875,069	13,150,744	18,000,000	373,990	-	56,262,756	38.86%	6,234,067	6	481,000.00									0	0	0	1					15,000.00	30,000.00	45,000.00			
31,608,766	19,739,647	10,589,021	1,700,102	18,193	66,788,301	47.33%	5,098,474	6	658,744.00									0	0	0	1										
8,171,569	4,445,689	6,301,981	433,480	1,500	20,214,719	40.42%	181,548.00	6	181,548.00									0	0	0	1										
28,061,493	19,331,724	8,405,958	1,513,841	3,973	60,066,099	46.72%	29,840,354	6	700,000.00									0	0	0	1										
9,317,956	4,514,188	8,100,000	489,805	844	23,356,893	39.89%	189,173	6	141,886.00									0	0	0	1										
25,055,807	18,740,000	13,946,957	1,328,107	7,583	64,661,763	38.79%	13,065,503	6	652,187.00					17,349.00	32,651.00		50,000.00	0	0	0	0										
13,977,988	4,200,000	5,000,000	575,953	4,090	24,906,231	56.39%	8,960,391	6	301,590.00								0	0	0	4	2										
36,433,487	22,422,803	9,085,826	1,958,558	6,520	77,347,914	47.10%	70,366,275	6	855,500.00								0	0	0	5	0										
14,304,373	8,234,130	8,887,421	746,513	1,747	33,582,458	42.59%	29,646,445	6	286,000.00						50,000.00		50,000.00	1	0	0	1										
15,826,538	7,600,350	8,102,250	847,913	7,072	33,975,307	46.59%		6	334,872.00								0	0	0	4	3										
6,261,485	4,605,927	5,700,000	320,069	10,055	17,350,026	36.09%		6	122,076.00								0	0	0	0	0										
20,805,492	10,737,769	25,410,000	1,096,725	1,537,721	60,764,806	34.24%	6,252,497	6	491,286.00					350,000.00			350,000.00	0	0	0	0										
20,155,871	16,877,227	4,626,296	1,060,354	2,523	46,994,971	41.14%	12,821,287	6	480,000.00								0	0	0	0	0										
39,031,919	28,636,375	6,867,137	1,709,390	1,300,631	75,519,962	42.42%	4,108,330	6	990,000.00								0	0	0	2	0										
15,929,738	6,600,000	-	600,147	17,637,246	41,179,631	38.68%		6	386,611.00								0	0	0	0	6										
14,514,579	8,002,200	3,500,000	780,967	9,013	28,273,149	51.34%	1,716,002	6	300,144.00								0	0	0	7	0										
227,842,321	181,217,379	325,000,000	12,286,715	159,106	869,751,939	26.45%	1,342,261,893	6	6,466,000.00					100,000.00	250,000.00	350,000.00	700,000.00	120	108	110	1										
5,933,239	46,805,500	25,000,000	3,264,106	5,053	140,965,793	4.21%	7,297,253	6	1,600,000.00								0	0	0	0	0										
87,945,777	56,836,968	20,000,000	4,746,211	34,373	183,018,938	48.05%	54,416,625	6	2,642,700.00								200,000.00	8	46	50	1										
12,565,688	7,977,000	9,935,961	682,291	5,386	32,175,326	39.05%	24,404,159	6	282,653.00								0	0	0	0	0										
204,063,564	140,372,883	105,000,000	10,936,603	36,830	13,769,545	38.42%	159,584,524	6	2 additional	12.00							0	0	0	18	62										
11,964,210	7,026,091	7,753,719	654,095	4,246	28,367,861	42.18%	7,505,942	6	325,000.00								0	0	0	0	0										
84,429,426	76,125,993	17,772,907	4,435,950	15,509	200,352,294	42.14%	20,132,629	6	1,668,588.00								0	0	0	39	47										
21,331,791	11,228,733	9,859,937	1,125,727	17,376	46,086,966	46.29%	7,781,657	6	480,000.00								0	0	0	8	15										
152,912,140	30,021,948	383,999,617	7,648,997	13,497,901	619,080,926	24.70%	465,473,547	6	2,207,857.00								0	0	0	67	105										
16,303,633	6,606,500	6,577,137	915,185	20,770	34,744,300	52.68%	4,766,315	6	295,256.00								0	0	0	8	7										
29,027,826	15,668,481	5,360,624	1,340,198	626,627	51,144,005	45.94%	26,649,003	6	600,000.00								0	0	0	2	0										
19,259,767	11,977,075	13,180,540	1,028,204	374,317	47,703,999	40.37%	1,315,125	6	470,181.00								0	0	0	0	0										
7,879,055	3,377,000	4,550,180	411,105	989	16,950,729	46.48%	2,551,300	6	125,000.00								10,500.00	0	0	0	2										
22,141,213	17,202,695	3,000,000	1,186,750	2,454	46,900,018	47.21%	5,742,149	6	596,976.00								0	0	0	4	10										
352,291,058	217,022,458	250,000,000	19,280,574	1,355,084	939,354,418	37.50%	919,144,137	6	7,170,354.00								0	0	0	4	10										
48,595,121	36,171,200	8,812,705	2,586,463	20,827	104,365,022	46.56%	30,409,203	6	1,020,000.00								55,000.00	85,000.00	7	17	27										
53,216,330	38,375,630	20,338,901	2,767,580	3,188	121,981,762	43.63%	27,260,980	6	1,064,000.00								129,000.00	129,000.00	7	17	29										
4,082,830	1,440,209	1,300,000	224,357	1,831	7,264,127	56.21%	1,520,512	6	75,182.00								7,500.00	10,000.00	1	0	0										
999,540	-	-	-	-	999,540	1	-	6	0.00								0.00	0.00	1	0	0										
51,538,048	-	1,052,252	-	6,012,799	4,389,855	91,140,203	-	6	0.00								0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00										
1,740,673,592	1,110,789,246	1,368,257,327	2,646,226	43,131,266	26,324,718	4,865,200,324	-	6	27.0																						

352291058	217022458	383999617	19280574	17637246	13769545	939354418	0.563450691	1,342,261,893	6	0.00	0.00	7,170,354.00	12.00	352.00	623.00	877.00	1,022,000.00	1,194,000.00	1,366,000.00	3,582,000.00	206.0	370.0	623.0	1.0	0.00	125.00	341.00	448,062.00	470,982.00	514,631.00
4082830	1440209	0	224357	844	0	7264127	0.04208992	189,173	6	0.00	0.00	75,182.00	12.00	10.00	623.00	877.00	5,000.00	500.00	10,000.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	1.00	5.00	10,000.00	3,500.00	6,794.00	
48232457.26	31736635.6	39037287.86	2646225.6	1060527.629	626710.3714	136373159.5	0.42033815	106,773,807	6	#DNV/0!	#DNV/0!	1,125,161.34	12.00	99.75	623.00	877.00	219,264.14	212,865.10	343,714.29	15.3	24.1	31.2	0.8	0.00	34.75	128.67	104,562.47	99,303.85	133,226.55	

ther than using security personnel
pport; Shifting budgets

e faculty

cap \$500000

ns established
for summer school \$50,000; eliminate support costs for summer school, newspaper program, college of arts and sciences programs, and telecommunications equipment \$332,456; Reduce mini grants for staff

	Total	Research Universities	Regional Universities	State Universities	State Colleges	Two Year Colleges
Number of Institutions	35	4	2	13	8	8
Total student enrollment, Fall 2008	283,048	84,822	29,254	90,758	35,010	43,204
Average number of undergraduate students	7,009	15,159	12,858	6,212	4,376	5,401
Average number of graduate students	1,078	6,046	1,769	770	0	0
Average annual enrollment growth, 1999 and 2008	5.01%	2.27%	2.72%	3.58%	7.09%	7.46%
Average number of faculty members	273	1022	503	213	115	98
Average other instructional (e.g., part-time, adjunct)	60	308	101	30	11	21
Average number of staff	865	4833	996	464	179	188
Average Student-to-Faculty ratio	36.1	18.8	28.8	31.7	37.9	51.8
Average institutional budget FY2010	162,837,681	856,826,668	211,639,464	91,596,534	41,189,050	39,341,026
Average real budget growth fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 2010, with budget cuts included (in 2007 dollars)	14.54%	4.48%	13.56%	10.75%	16.84%	12.21%
Percentage of institution's budget that comes from state appropriations	42.0%	31.8%	45.8%	43.1%	46.44%	40.15%
Average institutional foundational wealth	106,773,807	721,616,025	40,838,903	18,741,214	12,133,728	2,654,848
Average dollar out per student 4% level	301	967	220	219	269	152
Average dollar out per student 6% level	433	1392	315	316	387	219
Average dollar out per student 8% level	530	1709	383	387	473	266
Average institutional federal stimulus dollars	2,646,226	12,538,222	3,756,896	1,672,044	805,356	846,475

	Totals	Level out
Action at 4% budget out		
1 Mandatory six day furlough	35	4%
39 Health and TRS Rate Increases	35	4%
19 Operating, equipment or IT budget reductions	21	4%
3 Eliminate positions	20	4%
16 Travel budgets reductions	18	4%
21 Operating hours of services (e.g., library) reductions	9	4%
4 Hiring or filling positions delays	7	4%
17 Library acquisition budget reductions	7	4%
23 Student support services reductions (e.g., tutoring, retention program)	7	4%
29 Marketing or recruitment budget reductions	7	4%
14 Restructure, reorganize, merge of programs or departments	6	4%
7 Part-time, contract, or temporary faculty increases	5	4%
11 Summer School reductions or restrictions	5	4%
18 Defer maintenance	5	4%
22 Contingency funds (carry forward savings or funds)	5	4%
32 Across-the-board budget cuts	5	4%
9 Program expansion delays	4	4%
13 Course reductions or elimination	4	4%
24 Health Plan - promote or increase high deductible enrollment	4	4%
28 Reduce state funded initiative (SFI) budgets	4	4%
5 Part-time, contract, or temporary workers reductions	3	4%
6 Replace senior faculty with junior, contract, shared or part-time facul	2	4%
8 Layoffs	2	4%
12 Program reductions or elimination	2	4%
20 Financial management (passing credit card fees to users)	2	4%
31 Investment Income	2	4%
33 Efficiency savings or Process Improvements	2	4%
37 Research budget decrease	2	4%
2 Additional furlough days	1	4%
10 Administrative services reductions or restrictions	1	4%
15 Eliminate departments	1	4%
25 Replace security services with electronic monitoring	1	4%
27 Redirect salaries to non-state funded accounts (e.g., tuition and gra	1	4%
30 Auxiliary or athletic funds	1	4%
34 User Fees - new or increased fees	1	4%
35 Close Centers	1	4%
36 Reduce fringe benefits for SFI	1	4%
38 Reduce or eliminate rentals or leases	1	4%
40 Reduce teaching and learning support	1	4%
52 Utility savings through changes to climate controls	0	4%

	Totals	
Action at 6% budget out		
3 Eliminate positions	24	6%
19 Operating, equipment or IT budget reductions	21	6%
16 Travel budgets reductions	13	6%
18 Defer maintenance	10	6%
4 Hiring or filling positions delays	8	6%
17 Library acquisition budget reductions	7	6%
29 Marketing or recruitment budget reductions	7	6%
32 Across-the-board budget cuts	7	6%
21 Operating hours of services (e.g., library) reductions	6	6%
23 Student support services reductions (e.g., tutoring, retention program)	6	6%
22 Contingency funds (carry forward savings or funds)	5	6%
28 Reduce state funded initiative (SFI) budgets	5	6%
5 Part-time, contract, or temporary workers reductions	3	6%
7 Part-time, contract, or temporary faculty increases	3	6%
8 Layoffs	3	6%
34 User Fees - new or increased fees	3	6%
2 Additional furlough days	2	6%
9 Program expansion delays	2	6%
13 Course reductions or elimination	2	6%
14 Restructure, reorganize, merge of programs or departments	2	6%
30 Auxiliary or athletic funds	2	6%
10 Administrative services reductions or restrictions	1	6%
12 Program reductions or elimination	1	6%
28 Utility savings through changes to climate controls	1	6%
31 Investment Income	1	6%
33 Efficiency savings or Process Improvements	1	6%
36 Reduce fringe benefits for SFI	1	6%
37 Research budget decrease	1	6%
38 Reduce or eliminate rentals or leases	1	6%
40 Reduce teaching and learning support	1	6%
50 Redirect salaries to non-state funded accounts (e.g., tuition and gra	1	6%
51 Implementation of Sallie Mae Tuition Pay	1	6%
6 Replace senior faculty with junior, contract, shared or part-time facul	0	6%
11 Summer School reductions or restrictions	0	6%
20 Financial management (passing credit card fees to users)	0	6%
52 Reduce supplement health insurance for grad students	0	6%

	Totals	
Action at 8% budget out		
3 Eliminate positions	18	8%
19 Operating, equipment or IT budget reductions	14	8%
16 Travel budgets reductions	10	8%
17 Library acquisition budget reductions	9	8%
18 Defer maintenance	8	8%
29 Marketing or recruitment budget reductions	6	8%
30 Auxiliary or athletic funds	6	8%
21 Operating hours of services (e.g., library) reductions	5	8%
4 Hiring or filling positions delays	4	8%
8 Layoffs	4	8%
2 Additional furlough days	3	8%
9 Program expansion delays	3	8%
14 Restructure, reorganize, merge of programs or departments	3	8%
28 Reduce state funded initiative (SFI) budgets	3	8%
31 Investment Income	3	8%
5 Part-time, contract, or temporary workers reductions	2	8%
7 Part-time, contract, or temporary faculty increases	2	8%
11 Summer School reductions or restrictions	2	8%
13 Course reductions or elimination	2	8%
20 Financial management (passing credit card fees to users)	2	8%
22 Contingency funds (carry forward savings or funds)	2	8%
23 Student support services reductions (e.g., tutoring, retention program)	2	8%
32 Across-the-board budget cuts	2	8%
33 Efficiency savings or Process Improvements	2	8%
34 User Fees - new or increased fees	2	8%
35 Close Centers	2	8%
6 Replace senior faculty with junior, contract, shared or part-time facul	1	8%
12 Program reductions or elimination	1	8%
25 Replace security services with electronic monitoring	1	8%
36 Reduce fringe benefits for SFI	1	8%
37 Research budget decrease	1	8%
38 Reduce or eliminate rentals or leases	1	8%
40 Reduce teaching and learning support	1	8%
50 Redirect salaries to non-state funded accounts (e.g., tuition and gra	1	8%
61 Reduce quality improvement programs	1	8%
62 Eliminate phone services	1	8%

Action	Level cut	Totals
1	Mandatory six day furlough	4% 35
2	Additional furlough days	4% 1
3	Eliminate positions	4% 20
4	Hiring or filling positions delays	4% 7
5	Part-time, contract, or temporary workers reductions	4% 3
6	Replace senior faculty with junior, contract, shared or part-time facul	4% 2
7	Part-time, contract, or temporary faculty increases	4% 5
8	Layoffs	4% 2
9	Program expansion delays	4% 4
10	Administrative services reductions or restrictions	4% 1
11	Summer School reductions or restrictions	4% 5
12	Program reductions or elimination	4% 2
13	Course reductions or elimination	4% 4
14	Restructure, reorganize, merge of programs or departments	4% 6
15	Eliminate departments	4% 1
16	Travel budgets reductions	4% 18
17	Library acquisition budget reductions	4% 7
18	Defer maintenance	4% 5
19	Operating, equipment or IT budget reductions	4% 21
20	Financial management (passing credit card fees to users)	4% 2
21	Operating hours of services (e.g., library) reductions	4% 9
22	Contingency funds (carry forward savings or funds)	4% 5
23	Student support services reductions (e.g., tutoring, retention program	4% 7
24	Health Plan - promote or increase high deductible enrollment	4% 4
25	Replace security services with electronic monitoring	4% 1
26	Utility savings through changes to climate controls	4% 0
27	Redirect salaries to non-state funded accounts (e.g., tuition and gran	4% 1
28	Reduce state funded initiative (SFI) budgets	4% 4
29	Marketing or recruitment budget reductions	4% 7
30	Auxiliary or athletic funds	4% 1
31	Investment Income	4% 2
32	Across-the-board budget cuts	4% 5
33	Efficiency savings or Process Improvements	4% 2
34	User Fees - new or increased fees	4% 1
35	Close Centers	4% 1
36	Reduce fringe benefits for SFI	4% 1
37	Research consortium budget decrease	4% 2
38	Reduce or eliminate rentals or leases	4% 1
39	Health and TRS Rate Increases	4% 35
40	Reduce teaching and learning support	4% 1
50	Redirect salaries to non-state funded accounts (e.g., tuition and gran	6% 1
51	Implementation of Sallie Mae Tuition Pay	6% 5
52	Reduce supplement health insurance for grad students	6% 5
60	Reduce quality improvement programs	8% 1
61	Eliminate phone services	8% 1

1	Additional furlough days	6% 2
3	Eliminate positions	6% 24
4	Hiring or filling positions delays	6% 8
5	Part-time, contract, or temporary workers reductions	6% 3
6	Replace senior faculty with junior, contract, shared or part-time facul	6% 0
7	Part-time, contract, or temporary faculty increases	6% 3
8	Layoffs	6% 3
9	Program expansion delays	6% 2
10	Administrative services reductions or restrictions	6% 1
11	Summer School reductions or restrictions	6% 0
12	Program reductions or elimination	6% 1
13	Course reductions or elimination	6% 2
14	Restructure, reorganize, merge of programs or departments	6% 2
15		
16	Travel budgets reductions	6% 13
17	Library acquisition budget reductions	6% 7
18	Defer maintenance	6% 10
19	Operating, equipment or IT budget reductions	6% 21
20	Financial management (passing credit card fees to users)	6% 0
21	Operating hours of services (e.g., library) reductions	6% 6
22	Contingency funds (carry forward savings or funds)	6% 5
23	Student support services reductions (e.g., tutoring, retention program	6% 6
24		
25		
26	Utility savings through changes to climate controls	6% 1
27		
28	Reduce state funded initiative (SFI) budgets	6% 5
29	Marketing or recruitment budget reductions	6% 7
30	Auxiliary or athletic funds	6% 2
31	Investment Income	6% 1
32	Across-the-board budget cuts	6% 7
33	Efficiency savings or Process Improvements	6% 1
34	User Fees - new or increased fees	6% 3
35		
36	Reduce fringe benefits for SFI	6% 1
37	Research consortium budget decrease	6% 1
38	Reduce or eliminate rentals or leases	6% 1
39		
40	Reduce teaching and learning support	6% 1
50	Redirect salaries to non-state funded accounts (e.g., tuition and gran	6% 1
51	Implementation of Sallie Mae Tuition Pay	6% 1
52	Reduce supplement health insurance for grad students	6% 1

1	Additional furlough days	8% 3
3	Eliminate positions	8% 18
4	Hiring or filling positions delays	8% 4
5	Part-time, contract, or temporary workers reductions	8% 2
6	Replace senior faculty with junior, contract, shared or part-time facul	8% 1
7	Part-time, contract, or temporary faculty increases	8% 2
8	Layoffs	8% 4
9	Program expansion delays	8% 3
10		
11	Summer School reductions or restrictions	8% 2
12	Program reductions or elimination	8% 1
13	Course reductions or elimination	8% 2
14	Restructure, reorganize, merge of programs or departments	8% 3
15		
16	Travel budgets reductions	8% 10
17	Library acquisition budget reductions	8% 9
18	Defer maintenance	8% 8
19	Operating, equipment or IT budget reductions	8% 14
20	Financial management (passing credit card fees to users)	8% 2
21	Operating hours of services (e.g., library) reductions	8% 5
22	Contingency funds (carry forward savings or funds)	8% 2
23	Student support services reductions (e.g., tutoring, retention program	8% 2
24		
25	Replace security services with electronic monitoring	8% 1
26		
27		
28	Reduce state funded initiative (SFI) budgets	8% 3
29	Marketing or recruitment budget reductions	8% 6
30	Auxiliary or athletic funds	8% 6
31	Investment Income	8% 3
32	Across-the-board budget cuts	8% 2
33	Efficiency savings or Process Improvements	8% 2
34	User Fees - new or increased fees	8% 2
35	Close Centers	8% 2
36	Reduce fringe benefits for SFI	8% 1
37	Research consortium budget decrease	8% 1
38	Reduce or eliminate rentals or leases	8% 1
39		
40	Reduce teaching and learning support	8% 1
50	Redirect salaries to non-state funded accounts (e.g., tuition and gran	8% 1
60	Reduce quality improvement programs	8% 1
61	Eliminate phone services	8% 1

USG No.	Number	Institution	Type of Institution	Students 1999	Total Students Fall 2007	Total students Fall 2007-2008	% change 2007-2008	% change 99-08	Average annual growth	Graduate Student	Undergraduates	Total employees	Faculty 2008	Other instructional	Non-instructional	Students per faculty	FY08 Budget in 2007 \$	FY09 Budget in 2008 \$	FY10 Budget in 2009 \$	FY10 in 2007 \$	Growth in 2007 \$	Percent growth 2008-20	Level 1 - 4% budget cut	Budget cut per student	Level 2 - 6% budget cut	Total Level 2	Budget cut per student	Level 3 - 8% budget cut	Total Level 3	Budget cut per student		
1	18	Georgia Institute of Technology	Research University	14074	18747	19494	3.98%	38.51%	3.85%	6177	13317	6125	867	129	5129	22.48	930,610,568	1,006,723,168	1,029,983,687	967,920,340	57,369,772	6.16%	10,756,188	552	4,709,935	15,466,123	793	3,373,617	16,839,740	966		
2	22	Georgia State University	Research University	23410	27134	28229	4.04%	20.59%	2.06%	7245	20984	3744	1098	106	2640	25.71	547,728,823	595,215,490	616,140,855	591,495,221	45,766,398	7.99%	8,714,798	309	4,357,399	13,072,197	463	4,357,399	17,429,596	617		
3	26	Medical College of Georgia	Research University	2409	2862	2919	1.99%	21.17%	2.12%	2267	652	4130	529	67	3534	5.52	587,582,710	609,618,400	632,550,307	607,248,295	19,665,585	3.35%	7,412,534	2,539	3,228,200	10,640,734	3,645	2,272,069	12,912,803	4,424		
4	32	University of Georgia	Research University	30912	33831	34180	1.03%	10.57%	1.06%	8496	25684	10650	1592	930	8128	21.47	1,098,834,740	1,134,179,199	1,149,539,821	1,103,558,228	4,723,488	0.43%	16,053,566	470	6,694,512	22,748,068	868	5,559,624	28,307,692	828		
Totals and Averages				70,895	82,574	84,922	2.76%	22.71%	2.27%	6,046	15,159	6,162	1,022	308	4,833	18.8	524692333	5620732595	5,795,164,114.00	5,795,164,114.00	0	4.46%	0	0	16,053,566	867	6,694,512	22,748,068	3,645	5,559,624	28,307,692	4,424
Max				34180	4.04%	38.51%	3.85%	8,496	25,684	10,650	1,592	930	8,128	26	1,098,834,740	1,134,179,199	1,149,539,821	1,103,558,228	57,309,772	0	16,053,566	2,539	6,694,512	22,748,068	3,645	5,559,624	28,307,692	4,424				
Min				2919	1.03%	10.57%	1.06%	2,267	652	3,744	529	67	2,540	6	547,728,823	595,215,490	616,140,855	591,495,221	4,723,488	7,412,534	309	3,228,200	10,640,734	463	2,272,069	12,912,803	617					
Average				21205.5	2.76%	23%	2%	6,046	15,159	6,162	1,022	308	4,833	19	791,189,210	83643064.3	856,828,667.50	822,555,520.80	31,366,310.55	0.04	10,734,269	967	4,747,512	15,481,781	1,392	3,890,677	19,372,458	1,709				

USG No.	Number	Institution	Type of Institution	Students 1999	Total Students Fall 2007	Total students Fall 2008	% change 2007-2008	% change 99-08	Average annual growth	Graduate Student Undergraduates	Total employees	Faculty 2008	Other instructional	Non-instructional	Students per faculty	FY08 Budget in 2007 \$	FY09 Budget in 2008 \$	FY10 Budget in 2009 \$	FY10 in 2007 \$	Growth in 2007 \$	Percent growth 2008-20	Level 1 - 4% budget cut	Budget cut per student	Level 2 - 6% budget cut	Total Level 2	Budget cut per student	Level 3 - 8% budget cut	Total Level 3	Budget cut per student	
5	20	Georgia Southern University	Regional University	14476	16841	17764	5.48%	22.71%	2.27%	1986	1947	587	148	1212	30.26	224,406,386	239,462,805	254,285,433	244,114,016	19,707,630	8.76%	4,033,521	227	1,759,603	5,793,124	326	1,245,288	7,038,412	396	
6	34	Valdosta State University	Regional University	8729	11280	11490	1.96%	31.53%	3.15%	1552	9938	1252	419	780	27.42	137,102,875	157,459,406	168,993,495	162,233,755	25,130,880	18.33%	2,439,000	212	1,064,000	3,503,000	305	753,000	4,256,000	370	
Totals and Averages				23,205	28,121	29,254	3.67%	27.17%	2.72%	1,769	12,858	1,600	503	101	996	28.8	524,609,233	562,073,259	5,795,164,114.00			13.56%		220		315		min	383	
		Max		14476	16841	17764	0.054806722	0.316301982	0.031630198	1986	15778	1947	587	148	1212	224406386	239462805	254285433.00	244,114,015.68	25,130,880.20	0.18	4,033,521	227	1,759,603	5,793,124	326	1,245,288	7,038,412	396	
		Min		8729	11280	11490	0.018617021	0.227134568	0.022713457	1552	9938	1252	419	53	780	137102875	157459406	168,993,495.00	162,233,755.20	19,707,629.68	0.09	2,439,000	212	1,064,000	3,503,000	305	753,000	4,256,000	370	
		Average		11602.5	14060.5	14627	0.036711871	0.2711718275	0.0271171827	1769	12858	1599.5	503	100.5	996	28.84239265	180754630.5	198461105.5	211,639,464.00	203,173,885.44	22,419,254.94	0.14	3,236,261	220	1,411,802	4,648,062	315	999,144	5,647,206	383

USG No.	Number	Institution	Type of Institution	Students 1999	Total Students Fall 2007	Total students Fall 2007-2008	% change 2007-2008	% change 99-08	Average annual growth	Graduate	Student Undergraduates	Total employees	Faculty 2008	Other instruction	Non-instructional	Students per faculty	FY08 Budget in 2007 \$	FY09 Budget in 2008 \$	FY10 Budget in 2009 \$	FY10 in 2007 \$	Growth in 2007 \$	Percent growth 2008-20	Level 1 - 4% budget cut	Budget cut per student	Level 2 - 6% budget cut	Total Level 2	Budget cut per Level 3 - 8% budget cut	Total Level 3	Budget cut per student	
7	2	Albany State University	State University	3356	4033	4176	3.55%	24.43%	2.44%	427	3749	555	143	9	403	29.20	67,036,491	68,758,694	68,530,234	65,779,425	-1,257,066	-1.80%	1,018,572	244	444,892	1,464,554	351	315,371	1,779,925	426
8	3	Armstrong Atlantic State University	State University	5668	6848	7067	3.20%	24.68%	2.47%	778	6289	594	212	38	344	33.33	72,402,796	77,489,740	81,574,452	78,311,474	5,908,678	8.16%	1,449,956	205	632,540	2,082,496	295	447,661	2,530,157	358
9	5	Augusta State University	State University	5405	6588	6689	1.53%	23.76%	2.38%	960	5729	614	201	22	391	33.28	64,519,276	68,409,187	69,682,599	66,895,295	2,376,019	3.68%	1,286,688	192	561,308	1,847,996	276	397,238	2,245,234	336
10	7	Clayton State University	State University	4449	6043	6074	0.51%	36.53%	3.65%	69	6005	598	178	15	405	34.12	64,205,322	72,315,079	77,160,680	74,074,253	9,768,931	15.19%	1,149,055	189	501,267	1,650,322	272	384,749	2,005,071	330
11	9	Columbus State University	State University	4911	7953	7951	4.71%	61.90%	6.19%	1045	6905	730	233	29	468	34.12	82,375,241	85,738,838	92,523,621	89,622,676	6,447,435	7.83%	1,863,299	209	726,800	2,392,089	391	523,111	2,915,200	367
12	13	Fort Valley State University	State University	2658	2568	3106	20.95%	16.85%	1.69%	95	3011	663	97	18	548	32.02	63,766,483	69,497,740	75,871,729	72,836,860	9,070,377	14.22%	1,022,446	329	446,864	1,469,310	473	318,147	1,787,457	575
13	15	Georgia College & State University	State University	5027	6249	6506	4.11%	29.42%	2.94%	930	5576	817	219	45	553	29.71	87,285,660	97,703,972	100,853,165	96,819,038	9,433,378	10.80%	1,333,302	205	666,651	1,999,953	307	666,651	2,666,604	410
14	21	Georgia Southwestern State University	State University	2569	2405	2717	12.97%	5.76%	0.58%	184	2533	264	95	7	162	28.60	34,808,254	34,924,991	40,152,001	38,545,921	3,737,667	10.74%	578,331	212	251,421	827,752	305	177,934	1,005,686	370
15	24	Kennesaw State University	State University	13158	20607	21449	4.09%	63.01%	6.30%	2335	19114	1806	599	65	1142	35.81	188,979,739	221,666,036	246,630,494	236,765,274	47,785,535	25.29%	3,882,433	181	1,694,297	5,576,730	260	1,200,462	6,777,192	316
16	28	North Georgia College & State University	State University	3525	5227	5500	5.22%	56.03%	5.60%	695	4805	575	178	38	359	30.90	68,940,563	70,977,629	68,138,524	7,321,912	12.04%	1,176,548	214	513,129	1,689,677	307	362,839	2,052,516	373	
17	29	Savannah State University	State University	2153	3189	3453	8.96%	60.38%	6.04%	138	3325	454	130	22	282	26.56	53,543,237	58,121,042	61,121,168	63,476,321	9,933,064	18.55%	896,045	259	392,682	1,288,727	373	292,000	1,570,727	455
18	31	Southern Polytechnic State University	State University	3631	4460	4818	8.03%	32.69%	3.27%	523	4295	444	153	12	279	31.49	51,237,001	58,002,074	62,384,112	59,888,748	8,651,747	16.89%	1,015,202	211	442,873	1,458,075	303	313,418	1,771,493	368
19	33	University of West Georgia	State University	8670	10677	11252	5.35%	29.78%	2.98%	1835	9417	1101	335	76	690	33.59	135,065,420	128,716,353	138,303,054	132,770,932	-2,294,488	-1.70%	2,229,703	198	975,975	3,205,678	285	683,598	3,889,276	346
Totals and Averages				65,180	86,467	90,758	6.40%	35.79%	3.58%				213	30	464	31.7	5246092333						10.75%		219		316		387	
	Max			13158	20607	21449	0.209501558	0.630110959	0.063011096	2335	19114	1806	599	76	1142	35.80801336	188979739	221666036	246,630,494.00	236,765,274.24	47,785,535.24	0.25	3,882,433	329	1,694,297	5,576,730	473	1,200,462	6,777,192	575
	Min			2153	2405	2717	0.005129902	0.057609965	0.005760996	69	2533	264	95	7	162	26.55153846	34808254	34824991	40,152,001.00	38,545,920.96	(2,294,488.16)	(0.02)	576,331	181	251,421	827,752	260	177,934	1,005,686	316
	Average			5013.846154	6651.307692	6961.354615	0.064018077	0.35786752	0.035786752	770	6212	707.3076923	213.3076923	30.46153846	463.5384615	31.74918723	78941656.31	87560331.46	91,596,533.69	87,932,672.34	8,991,016.04	0.11	1,438,505	219	634,830	2,073,335	316	464,860	2,538,195	387

Other equip+IT 4%	Other equip +IT 6%	Other equip +IT 8%	Utility Budget 4%	Utility Budget 6%	Utility Budget 8%	Delay hiring or filling pi	Replace senior faculty	Eliminating or reducing	Delay new programs o	Reducing student supp	Merging programs or c SFI transfers	Other Income (Auxiliar Financial Mngt	Contingency funds or Marketing and Student	Across-the-board cuts	Reserach budget cuts	Higher Deductable He	New User or student ft	Efficiency or Process I	Reduce part-time facu	Other	FY08 Budget	FY09 Budget	FY11 Budget	Mission	
272,415.00	353,948.00	361,724.00		66,000.00							320,010.00	200,000.00													
220,889.00	250,000.00																								
					15,000.00																				
352,093.00		187,653.00	x		x																				
493,836.00	1,799,878.00	2,919,830.00																							
277,113.00	526,964.00	570,464.00																							
346,327.00			20,000.00																						
129,455.00		271,782.00																							
96,198.00	196,273.00																								

telecommunications equipment \$332,456; Reduce mini grants for staff

USG No.	Number	Institution	Type of Institution	Students 1999	Total Students Fall 2007	Total students Fall % change 2007-2008	% change 99-08	Average annual growth	Graduate Student Undergraduates	Total employees	Faculty 2008	Other instructiona	Non-instructional	Students per facu	FY08 Budget in 2007 \$	FY09 Budget in 2008 \$	FY10 Budget in 2009 \$	FY10 in 2007 \$	Growth in 2007 \$	Percent growth 2008-2010 in	Level 1 - 4% budget cur	Budget cut per student	Level 2 - 6% budget cur	Total Level 2	Budget cut per	Level 3 - 8% budget cur	Total Level 3	Budget cut per student	
20	1	Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	State College	2609	3665	3600	-1.77%	37.98%	3.60%	0	3600	271	90	40.00	34,713,747	38,767,113	37,517,510	36,016,810	1,303,063	3.75%	652,146	181	284,455	936,641	260	201,341	1,137,862	316	
21	8	College of Coastal Georgia	State College	1999	2942	2932	-0.34%	46.67%	4.67%	0	2932	210	61	48.07	58,278,046	29,040,223	29,002,450	27,642,352	-436,697	-1.54%	640,980	219	279,624	920,604	314	197,890	1,118,494	381	
22	10	Dalton State College	State College	3051	4532	4957	9.38%	62.47%	6.25%	0	4957	296	117	42.37	35,646,127	34,261,829	38,328,003	36,794,883	1,148,756	3.22%	657,245	133	286,122	943,367	190	201,123	1,144,490	231	
23	14	Gainesville State College	State College	3036	7474	8238	10.22%	171.34%	17.13%	0	8238	407	162	27	218	38,990,454	52,320,243	58,567,349	56,224,650	44,209	11.2%	924,185	112	403,168	1,327,353	161	285,336	1,612,689	196
24	16	Georgia Gwinnett College	State College	0	788	1563	98.35%		15.63%	0	1563	256	112	2	142	28,317,467	41,750,093	43,417,781	41,681,070	47,199	15.17%	1,517,679	971	871,340	2,189,019	1,401	496,340	2,685,359	1,718
25	23	Gordon College	State College	2758	3703	3855	4.10%	39.78%	3.98%	0	3855	252	98	8	146	29,826,546	35,342,061	38,866,862	37,312,188	7,485,642	25.10%	546,000	142	240,000	786,000	204	172,500	958,500	249
26	25	Macon State College	State College	3742	6464	6431	-0.51%	71.86%	7.19%	0	6431	397	164	14	210	48,296,283	52,336,233	51,020,967	49,980,128	583,845	1.21%	978,759	152	426,983	1,405,742	219	302,191	1,707,933	266
27	27	Middle Georgia College	State College	2964	3444	3434	-0.29%	68.38%	6.64%	0	3434	365	118	2	235	40,030,660	46,838,911	46,521,162	44,660,316	4,629,656	11.57%	836,185	244	366,468	1,202,673	350	263,279	1,465,952	427
Totals and Averages				19,259	33,012	35,010	14.89%	70.93%	7.09%			115	11	179	37.9	5246092333	5620732595	5,795,164,114.00			16.84%		269			387			473
Max				3742	7474	8238	0.983502538	1.713438735	0.171343874	0	8238	407	164	27	235	50,85185185	48396283	52620243	58,567,349.00	56,224,655.04	0.47	1,517,679	971	671,340	2,189,019	1,401	496,340	2,685,359	1,718
Min				0	788	1563	-0.017735334	0.379839019	0.037983902	0	1563	210	61	2	129	28279049	29040223	29,002,450.00	27,842,352.00	(436,697.00)	(0.02)	546,000	112	240,000	786,000	161	172,500	958,500	196
Average				2407.375	4126.5	4376.25	0.148925721	0.709262242	0.070926224	0	4376.25	305.5	115.25	11.375	178.875	36525041.63	41269588.25	42,905,260.50	41,189,050.08	5,664,008.46	0.17	844,147	269	369,778	1,213,925	387	265,000	1,478,925	473

Other equip+IT 4%	Other equip +IT 6%	Other equip +IT 8%	Utility Budget 4%	Utility Budget 6%	Utility Budget 8%	Delay hiring or filling pi	Replace senior faculty	Eliminating or reducing	Delay new programs o	Reducing student supp	Merging programs or c	SFI transfers	Other Income (Auxiliar Financial Mngt	Contingency funds o	Marketing and Student	Across-the-board cuts	Reserach budget cuts	Higher Deductable He	New User or student ft	Efficiency or Process I	Reduce part-time facu	Other	FY08 Budget	FY09 Budget	FY11 Budget	Mission	
0.00	0.00	0.00				60,000.00		57,848.00		75,000.00	25,000.00		75,000.00														
181,907.00	78,122.00		10,000.00	10,000.00				125,000.00	75,000.00	10,000.00	40,000.00		65,000.00														
235,000.00	410,599.00			10,000.00				100,000.00	71,123.00		80,000.00																
	100,000.00			190,000.00		363,500.00	397,000.00	150,000.00					172,500.00	60,000.00													
55,260.00	43,168.00			25,900.00						209,000.00																	

Install alarm system rather than using security personnel

USG No.	Number	Institution	Type of Institution	Students 1999	Total Students Fall 2007	Total students Fall % change 2007-2008	% change 99-08	Average annual growth	Graduate Student	Undergraduates	Total employees	Faculty 2008	Other instructiona	Non-instructional	Students per facu	FY08 Budget in 2007 \$	FY09 Budget in 2008 \$	FY10 Budget in 2009 \$	FY10 in 2007 \$	Growth in 2007 \$	Percent growth 2008-20	Level 1 - 4% budget cu	Budget cut per student	Level 2 - 6% budget cu	Total Level 2	Budget cut per Level 3 - 8% budget cur	Total Level 3	Budget cut per student		
28	4	Atlanta Metropolitan College	Two Year College	1887	1882	2241	19.88%	18.76%	1.88%	0	2241	170	42	5	123	53.36	18,079,646	20,357,827	23,049,501	22,126,561	4,046,915	22.38%	374,704	167	163,461	530,155	240	115,681	653,846	292
29	6	Barclay College	Two Year College	1279	2661	3091	16.16%	14.17%	14.17%	0	3091	186	48	23	115	64.40	20,655,726	23,024,153	24,937,274	23,939,783	3,254,057	15.73%	432,552	140	181,056	613,608	199	131,896	745,504	241
30	11	Darton College	Two Year College	2674	4760	5019	5.44%	87.70%	8.77%	0	5019	269	115	1	153	43.64	38,727,580	39,513,863	38,545,413	37,003,696	-1,723,984	-4.45%	725,995	145	316,712	1,042,707	208	224,142	1,266,849	252
31	12	East Georgia College	Two Year College	1310	1987	2555	28.59%	95.04%	8.50%	0	2555	133	47	1	85	54.36	14,611,071	17,030,428	18,224,556	17,495,574	19,745,574	19.74%	287,514	113	125,431	412,945	162	88,779	501,724	196
32	17	Georgia Highlands College	Two Year College	2038	4346	4690	7.92%	130.01%	13.00%	0	4690	274	95	25	154	49.37	25,943,656	27,883,783	29,526,272	28,345,221	2,401,565	9.26%	665,843	142	294,239	960,073	205	201,814	1,161,887	246
33	19	Georgia Perimeter College	Two Year College	14091	21473	22808	6.22%	61.86%	6.19%	0	22808	1186	376	113	697	60.66	138,837,508	145,130,418	150,800,874	144,768,839	5,931,331	4.27%	2,719,059	119	1,186,166	3,905,225	171	839,438	4,744,663	208
34	30	South Georgia College	Two Year College	1226	1756	1864	6.15%	52.04%	5.20%	0	1864	159	39	0	120	47.79	16,457,756	20,343,034	21,352,172	20,498,085	4,040,329	24.55%	361,270	194	157,601	518,871	278	111,533	630,404	338
35	35	Waycross College	Two Year College	851	989	936	-5.36%	9.99%	1.00%	0	936	76	23	0	53	49.70	7,494,826	8,293,300	8,293,142	7,961,416	466,590	6.23%	187,263	200	86,449	272,712	291	54,061	326,773	349
Totals and Averages				25,357	39,854	43,204	10.52%	74.63%	7.46%			98	21	188	51.8							12.214%		152		219			266	
Max				14091	21473	22808	0.28585078	1.416731622	0.141673182	0	22808	1186	376	113	697	64.39593333	138837508	145130418	150800874.00	144768839.04	5931331.04	0.25	2719059	200	1186166	3905225	291	839438	4744663	349
Min				851	989	936	-0.053589484	0.099882491	0.009988249	0	936	76	23	0	53	40.69565217	7494826	8253300	8293142.00	7961416.32	(1,723,983.52)	(0.04)	187263	113	85449	272712	162	54061	326773	196
Average				3169.625	4981.75	5400.5	0.105232003	0.746339896	0.07463399	0	5400.5	306.625	98.125	21	187.5	51.78458451	35104721.13	37692100.75	39341025.50	37767384.48	2,662,663.36	0.12	719.275	152	313,763	219	220,918	1,253,956	266	

Other equip+IT 4%	Other equip +IT 6%	Other equip +IT 8%	Utility Budget 4%	Utility Budget 6%	Utility Budget 8%	Delay hiring or filling pi	Replace senior faculty	Eliminating or reducing	Delay new programs o	Reducing student supp	Merging programs or c	SFI transfers	Other Income (Auxiliar Financial Mngt	Contingency funds or Marketing and Student	Across-the-board cuts	Reserach budget cuts	Higher Deductable He	New User or student ft	Efficiency or Process I	Reduce part-time facul	Other	FY08 Budget	FY09 Budget	FY11 Budget	Mission	
298,552.00	54,480.00	45,520.00				104,000.00	126,866.00			20,000.00	67,000.00															
20,000.00	92,571.00	95,780.00	1,800.00			302,848.00				92,571.00			31,000.00													
	178,024.00									5,000.00																
45,000.00	286,165.00	90,000.00			200,000.00							88,657.00	300,000.00													
31,751.00	98,467.00									50,000.00			35,000.00	1,119,059.00	100,000.00											
	79,700.00									17,511.00				135,956.00	15,000.00						55,500.00					

Eliminate Office of IR

USG No.	Number	Institution	Type of Institution	Students 1999	Total students	Fa % change 2007-2008	% change 99-08	Average annual growth Faculty 2008	Other instructions Non-instructional	FY10 Budget in 2009 \$	Percent growth 2008-20	Budget out per student	Budget cut per student	Federal Stimulus	Percent state appropri	Foundations and Component Units	June 2008		
1	18	Georgia Institute of Technology	Research University	14074	19494	3.88%	38.51%	3.85%	867	129	5129	1,029,083,687	6.16%	552	783	866	12,286,715	26.45%	1,342,261,893
2	22	Georgia State University	Research University	23410	28229	4.04%	20.69%	2.06%	1098	106	2540	616,140,855	7.99%	306	463	617	10,936,603	38.42%	159,584,524
3	26	Medical College of Georgia	Research University	2409	2919	1.99%	21.17%	2.12%	529	67	3634	632,550,307	3.35%	2,539	3,645	4,424	7,648,997	24.70%	465,473,547
4	32	University of Georgia	Research University	30912	34180	1.03%	10.57%	1.06%	1592	930	8128	1,149,539,821	6.43%	470	666	828	19,280,574	37.50%	919,144,137
5	20	Georgia Southern University	Regional University	14476	17784	5.48%	22.71%	2.27%	587	148	1212	264,285,433	8.76%	227	328	398	4,746,211	46.05%	64,418,825
6	34	Valdosta State University	Regional University	8729	11490	1.86%	31.63%	3.16%	419	53	780	168,993,495	18.33%	212	305	370	2,767,580	43.63%	27,260,980
7	2	Albany State University	State University	3356	4176	3.50%	24.43%	2.44%	143	9	403	68,520,234	-1.88%	244	351	426	1,170,228	38.88%	6,234,087
8	3	Armstrong Atlantic State University	State University	5668	7087	3.20%	24.68%	2.47%	212	38	344	81,574,452	8.16%	205	295	358	1,700,102	47.33%	6,088,474
9	5	Augusta State University	State University	5405	6689	1.53%	23.76%	2.38%	201	22	391	69,682,599	3.68%	192	276	336	1,513,641	46.72%	29,840,354
10	7	Clayton State University	State University	4449	6074	0.51%	36.53%	3.65%	178	15	405	77,180,680	15.19%	189	272	330	1,328,107	38.75%	13,065,503
11	9	Columbus State University	State University	4911	7951	4.71%	61.90%	6.19%	233	29	468	92,523,621	7.83%	209	301	367	1,858,558	47.10%	30,366,275
12	13	Fort Valley State University	State University	2658	3106	20.95%	16.85%	1.69%	97	18	548	75,871,729	14.22%	329	473	575	1,096,725	34.24%	6,252,497
13	15	Georgia College & State University	State University	5027	6506	4.11%	29.42%	2.94%	219	45	553	100,853,165	10.80%	205	307	410	1,709,390	42.42%	4,126,330
14	21	Georgia Southwestern State University	State University	2569	2717	12.97%	5.76%	0.56%	95	7	162	40,152,001	10.74%	212	305	370	682,291	38.05%	24,404,159
15	24	Kennesaw State University	State University	13158	21446	4.00%	63.01%	6.30%	599	65	1142	246,630,484	25.29%	181	260	316	4,435,950	42.14%	20,132,629
16	28	North Georgia College & State University	State University	3525	5500	5.22%	56.03%	5.60%	178	38	359	70,977,629	12.04%	214	307	373	1,340,158	48.94%	26,649,003
17	29	Savannah State University	State University	2153	3453	8.96%	60.38%	6.04%	130	22	282	66,121,168	18.55%	259	373	455	1,028,204	40.37%	1,315,125
18	31	Southern Polytechnic State University	State University	3631	4816	9.03%	32.69%	3.27%	153	12	279	62,384,112	16.89%	211	303	368	1,186,750	47.21%	5,742,148
19	33	University of West Georgia	State University	8670	11252	5.39%	29.78%	2.98%	335	76	690	138,303,054	-1.70%	198	285	346	2,586,463	46.56%	30,409,203
20	1	Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	State College	2609	3600	-1.77%	37.98%	3.80%	90	5	176	37,517,510	3.75%	181	260	316	765,173	51.60%	13,454,058
21	8	College of Coastal Georgia	State College	1990	2932	-0.34%	46.87%	4.67%	61	20	129	29,002,450	-1.54%	219	314	381	575,853	56.35%	8,960,391
22	10	Dalton State College	State College	3051	4957	9.38%	62.47%	6.25%	117	13	166	38,328,003	3.22%	133	190	231	746,513	42.59%	29,646,445
23	14	Gainesville State College	State College	3036	8238	10.22%	171.34%	17.13%	162	27	218	58,567,349	44.20%	112	161	196	1,060,954	41.14%	12,821,287
24	16	Georgia Gwinnett College	State College	0	1563	98.35%			112	2	142	43,417,781	47.19%	971	1,401	1,718	600,147	38.68%	
25	23	Gordon College	State College	2758	3855	4.10%	39.78%	3.98%	98	8	146	38,866,862	25.10%	142	204	249	654,095	42.18%	7,505,942
26	25	Macon State College	State College	3742	6431	-0.51%	71.86%	7.19%	164	14	219	51,020,967	1.21%	152	219	266	1,125,727	46.29%	7,781,657
27	27	Middle Georgia College	State College	2064	3434	-0.29%	66.38%	6.64%	118	2	235	46,521,162	11.57%	244	350	427	915,185	52.68%	4,766,315
28	4	Atlanta Metropolitan College	Two Year College	1887	2241	19.08%	18.76%	1.88%	42	5	123	23,048,501	22.38%	167	240	292	433,480	40.42%	
29	6	Bainbridge College	Two Year College	3091	3091	16.16%	141.67%	14.17%	48	23	115	24,837,274	15.73%	140	199	241	489,805	39.89%	189,173
30	11	Darton College	Two Year College	2674	5019	5.44%	87.70%	8.77%	115	1	153	38,545,413	-4.45%	145	208	252	847,913	46.59%	
31	12	East Georgia College	Two Year College	1310	2555	28.59%	95.94%	9.59%	47	1	85	18,224,556	19.74%	113	162	196	320,069	36.09%	
32	17	Georgia Highlands College	Two Year College	2039	4690	7.92%	130.01%	13.00%	95	25	154	29,626,272	9.26%	142	205	248	780,967	51.34%	1,716,002
33	19	Georgia Perimeter College	Two Year College	14091	22808	6.22%	61.86%	6.19%	376	113	697	150,800,874	4.27%	119	171	208	3,264,106	4.21%	7,297,253
34	30	South Georgia College	Two Year College	1226	1864	6.15%	52.94%	5.20%	39	0	120	21,352,172	24.55%	194	278	338	411,105	46.46%	2,551,300
35	35	Waycross College	Two Year College	851	936	-5.36%	9.99%	1.00%	23	0	53	8,293,142	6.23%	200	291	349	224,357	56.21%	1,520,512
				5,795,164,114	14,544,000	14.54%	301	433	530	92,617,896									
Totals and Averages				203,806	283,048	8.71%	50.12%	5.01%			5,795,164,114.00			161	196				
Max						98.35%	171.34%	17.13%		1,149,539,821	0	2,539	3,645	4,424	19,280,574				
Min						-5.36%	0.58%	0.58%		8,293,142	0	112	161	196	224,357				