



**University System of Georgia
Executive/Administrative/Managerial Staff
Per FTE Student as Reported to IPEDS
FY 2000**

Background

A frequently asked question related to the efficiency and effectiveness of higher education institutions is: “Are there too many administrators?” Because institutions vary widely in mission, level and mix of programs, size and composition of the student body, and other relevant characteristics, there is no single standard by which to answer that question.

One indicator of relative administrative staffing that has recently been reviewed by the University System of Georgia (USG) is the ratio of full-time equivalent (FTE) students to administrators. Up to a point, the higher the ratio, the “better” an institution’s relative number of administrators is considered to be. Underlying this indicator is the question, unanswerable by data, of what the point of balance should be to effectively and efficiently manage an institution. The FY 2000 ratios for the University System’s four-year and two-year institutions were compared with the corresponding four-year public and two-year public average ratios of the other Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states. USG four-year public institutions were found to have the second lowest average ratio in SREB, and USG two-year colleges had the lowest average ratio in SREB for those respective categories of institutions. Thus, Georgia has relatively fewer FTE students per administrator, or conversely, relatively more administrators in relation to enrollment than other SREB states.

It is important to note that, although the number of FTE students enrolled does provide a rough but consistent comparative measure of the need for administrative support, there is no single reliable indicator of the ideal number of administrators needed from institution to institution. While institutions with larger enrollments (and/or more programs, facilities, off-campus locations, etc.) may need more administrators, there are economies of scale that benefit larger institutions and disadvantage smaller ones. For example, the same basic complement of “executive, administrative and managerial” positions may be as necessary and efficient for an institution with 2,500 FTE students as for one with 4,000 FTE. However, using the FTE per administrator ratio to compare those institutions would suggest that the smaller institution has “too many” administrators.

With these caveats in mind, this paper examines where the data to support the SREB comparisons originate and how University System institutions compare with one another using the same data.

How National Data Are Collected

The federal government collects educational data from colleges and universities in the U.S. through a set of surveys administered by IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System). The IPEDS Fall Staff Survey is administered only in odd-numbered calendar years. A

portion of that survey replaced the discontinued Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO-6) survey. Although the data for some IPEDS surveys are generated by the University System for the institutions, the Fall Staff data are reported directly to IPEDS by the institutions themselves. In reporting Fall Staff data, each institution is responsible for interpreting the IPEDS Fall Staff instructions and reporting its staff positions accordingly.

The IPEDS instructions categorize full-time institutional employees in fall term into one of the following seven groups: full-time faculty; executive, administrative and managerial; other professionals (support service); technical and paraprofessionals; clerical and secretarial; skilled crafts; and service/maintenance. The category of interest here is “executive, administrative and managerial.” The FY 2000 IPEDS Fall Staff instructions for reporting “executive/administrative/managerial” positions read as follows:

*Report all persons whose assignments require primary (and major) responsibility for management of the institution, or a customarily recognized department or subdivision thereof. Assignments require the performance of work directly related to management policies or general business operations of the institution, department or subdivision, etc. It is assumed that assignments in this category customarily and regularly require the incumbent to exercise discretion and independent judgment and to direct the work of others. Report in this category all officers holding titles such as president, vice president, dean, director, or the equivalent, as well as officers subordinate to any of these administrators with such titles as associate dean, assistant dean, executive officer of academic departments (department heads, or the equivalent) if their principal activity is administrative. **NOTE** – Supervisors of professional employees are included here, while supervisors of nonprofessional employees (technical, clerical, craft, and service/maintenance force) are to be reported within the specific categories of the personnel they supervise.*

There is considerable potential for inconsistent interpretation of these instructions. The single category, “executive, administrative and managerial,” encompasses a very wide range of positions, from the institutional CEO to the managers of small administrative units. Although the president and vice presidents are clearly institutional executives, it is less certain that every institution would report the bookstore manager and similar positions in the same category, i.e., as “central to the management of the institution.”

Another judgment required by the instructions that could easily vary by institution is whether a dean’s or a department chair’s “principal activity is administrative.” Similarly, a manager who supervises nonprofessional employees may have greater responsibility than one who supervises fewer professional employees and has a smaller budget, but the instructions state that the former should not be reported in the “executive, administrative and managerial” section of the Fall Staff Survey. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that both types of managers are reported in the “executive, administrative and managerial” category by some institutions.

How USG Institutions Determine Executive/Administrative/Managerial Status

Each USG job has been assigned a position identifier code called a "b-code." These codes were established in the 1970s, and although codes were added to the b-code system over the last three

decades, few were removed or revised. For reporting purposes, University System b-codes were “mapped” to one of the six job category codes used in the annual EEO report. The EEO code 1 category was also called “executive/administrative/managerial.” A list of the b-codes/positions mapped to that category is attached (Table 1). (It is important to note that not all occupations exist, or are filled, at every institution, and therefore would not be reported.)

When the transition was made from EEO to IPEDS reporting, the EEO-1 b-code map continued to be used, although in the last few years there have been questions about the correspondence of the EEO-1 b-code map to the specific requirements of IPEDS.¹ In August 2003, the Office of Strategic Research and Analysis surveyed USG institutions to determine how they reported positions in the “executive, administrative and managerial” category of their FY 2000 IPEDS Fall Staff Surveys.

The results showed that USG institutions did not report staff data in a uniform way. Some reported all EEO-1 b-codes, and some edited the list of b-codes, i.e., removed or added positions, based on knowledge of the actual position or incumbent, as summarized below.

- Twenty of the institutions in this analysis reported all EEO-1 positions that were filled at their institution to IPEDS.
- 13 reported selected sub-sets of the EEO-1 b-codes or additional b-codes.
- One institution was not able to determine how the survey was completed in 1999 due to personnel changes since then.

A logical assumption would be that institutions reporting all EEO-1 b-codes would have small ratios, i.e., they would have over-reported administrators. However, analysis of the FTE student/administrator ratios in Table 2 suggests that the method of reporting “executive, administrative and managerial” staff to IPEDS does not, by itself, appear to be responsible for any over-reporting of those positions:

- A larger proportion (58 percent) of the institutions that reported a selection of b-codes from the EEO-1 list had lower-than-average (i.e., less desirable) FTE/administrator ratios than those reporting all EEO-1 b-codes to IPEDS (53 percent).
- Five of the six largest USG institutions reported all EEO-1 positions to IPEDS, and only two of those five had lower-than-average FTE/administrator ratios.

How USG Institutions Compare Internally and with the Other SREB States in the Ratio of FTE Students to Administrators

Colleges and universities in other states are subject to the same potential reporting inconsistencies as those discussed above. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the data on “executive, administrative and managerial” positions in the other SREB states also contain inconsistencies, although there is no way to determine those institutions’ exact reporting

¹ Largely in response to those questions, a special USG human resources committee has reviewed and converted the previous b-code system. B-codes were grouped into larger b-categories. The new codes are designated BCATs, and were developed to comply with the IPEDS Fall Staff and other survey instructions.

practices. Nevertheless, Table 3, which has been re-calculated to insure that both tables in this analysis are based on the same data and assumptions, shows that the USG four-year public institutions have the second-lowest average FTE to administrator ratio among the SREB states, and that USG two-year public institutions have the lowest average ratio in SREB (where a low ratio means more administrators relative to enrollment than a higher ratio).²

The following are highlights of Table 2, which contains internal comparisons of FTE students/administrator ratios for the USG four-year institutions and USG two-year institutions:³

- USG four-year institutions have an average of 56.0 FTE students per executive-administrative-managerial staff, and USG two-year colleges have a corresponding average of 83.3 FTE/administrator.
- The comparative SREB average ratios are 81.8 (public four-year) and 199.4 (public two-year).
- Seventeen of the 32 USG institutions included in this comparative analysis, or 53 percent, had 1999-2000 student/administrator ratios that were higher (better) than the respective System averages, i.e., 11 of 19 four-year institutions (58 percent) and 6 of 13 two-year colleges (46 percent).⁴ In addition, only two of the six largest USG institutions have a lower-than-average FTE student/administrator ratio. Thus, the relatively low USG vs. SREB ratios are not due to one or two outliers in the USG, skewing the whole System average.
- 38.5 percent (5 of 13) of the four-year institutions that reported all EEO-1 positions to IPEDS, rather than an edited subset of EEO-1 positions, and 50 percent (3 of 6) of the two-year colleges that reported in the same manner had lower (less desirable) FTE/administrator ratios than the respective USG averages.
- Even larger proportions, 3 of 5 four-year institutions (60 percent) and 4 of 7 two-year colleges (57 percent), than reported selected subsets of the EEO-1 b-codes also had lower-than-average ratios.

Conclusions

Although the potential for inconsistency in interpreting the IPEDS Fall Staff instructions exists for all public colleges and universities in SREB, the 1999-2000 IPEDS data published by SREB show that University System four-year and two-year public institutions, collectively, have relatively fewer FTE students per administrator, or relatively more administrators, than peers in the other 15 SREB states. The same data also show anomalies within the USG. For example, several pairs of institutions with similar enrollments had FTE/administrator ratios that differed

² Tables 2 and 3 use 1999-2000 enrollment and staff data, and both include Dalton State College and Macon State College as four-year institutions because that is the convention followed by both IPEDS and the *SREB Fact Book, 2003*.

³ FTE student data are from "FTE Enrollment, Public Colleges, by College 1999-2000" on the SREB web site at <http://www.sreb.org/main/EdData/DataExch/dataexchindex.asp#Full-time>; administrator data by state (Table 3) are from Table 69 in the *SREB Fact Book*, and 1999-2000 administrator data by USG institution (Table 2) were obtained with the IPEDS web-based Peer Analysis Tool (IPEDS is the original source of the staff data published by SREB).

⁴ This analysis follows the SREB practice of excluding "specialized institutions," i.e., Medical College of Georgia and Southern Polytechnic State University.

by 64 to 328 percent. Another institution reported just five “executive, administrative and managerial” positions, compared to an average of 31 administrators reported by six comparable institutions.

Within the University System, there is no apparent link between the method of reporting “executive, administrative and managerial” positions (i.e., reporting all EEO-1 positions or a selected subset) and the resulting ratio of FTE per administrator. More than half (53 percent) of the USG institutions studied in this report had higher (better) than the comparable System average FTE/administrator ratios, and the two reporting methods were randomly distributed among institutions with both lower-than-average and higher-than-average ratios.

However, since the data on which the SREB comparative ranking is based were reported to IPEDS, USG human resources officers undertook a comprehensive review and redesign of the University System’s job classification system. A major motivation for that project was more accurate and consistent reporting of staff to IPEDS, particularly executive, administrative and managerial positions. Therefore, the IPEDS Fall Staff Survey instructions and definitions served as the primary guide as that committee developed the new USG job classification codes.

The revised classification system was adopted by the Board of Regents at the April 2003 Board meeting. Test runs of the IPEDS Fall Staff data using the revised coding system have produced a higher executive, administrative and managerial count at some institutions and a lower count at others, but for the University System as a whole, that category is approximately 16 percent lower than the corresponding total reported to IPEDS in 2001.

While that decrease in executive, administrative and managerial positions has resulted from a re-classification of positions rather than a quantitative decrease in positions defined identically from 2001 to 2003, the design of the new system and the rigor of assigning the new classification codes supports the assumption that the current numbers are accurate in relation to the IPEDS definitions. It is also anticipated that the 2003 data will improve the ranking of the USG in this measure among SREB states.

For more information, write or email:

Dr. Joe Szutz
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning
Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia
270 Washington St., SW
Atlanta, Georgia 3033

Joe.Szutz@usg.edu

Table 1

**University System of Georgia
Job Classification File: By EEO Code**

(B-Codes) JOB CLASS #	JOB TITLE	(Exec/Admin/Mgr) EEO CODE	EE CLASS
-----	-----	----	-----
B0025	ASST RECORDS MANAGER	1	PA
B0026	RECORDS MANAGER	1	PA
B0308	STAFF BENEFITS MANAGER	1	PA
B0310	EMPLOYMENT MANAGER	1	PA
B0351	DIRECTOR OF VOLUNTEER SERVICE	1	PA
B0365	SMALL BUSINESS DEV CENTER ADM	1	PA
B0480	ASST TO THE DEAN-ADMIN AFFAIRS	1	PA
B0534	ASST SUPPLY MANAGER	1	PA
B0535	SUPPLY MANAGER	1	PA
B0537	HEAD SUPPLY AND MATERIALS	1	PA
B0554	ASST BOOKSTORE MANAGER	1	PA
B0555	BOOKSTORE MANAGER	1	PA
B0663	DIRECTOR TEACHER CORPS	1	PA
B0673	CAMP MANAGER	1	PA
B0674	CAMP MANAGER II	1	PA
B0685	DIRECTOR EDUC OPPORTUNITY CTR	1	PA
B0686	DEVEL THERAPY INSTITUTE	1	PA
B0974	UNIT ADMINISTRATOR	1	PA
B0978	VET MEDICINE HOSPITAL ADMIN	1	PA
B0979	HOSPITAL ADMISSIONS DIRECTOR	1	PA
B1072	DIRECTOR OF AUTOPSY FACILITIES	1	PA
B1156	FOREST RESOURCES MANAGER	1	PA
B1178	HEAD GROUNDS MAINTENANCE	1	PA
B1409	HEAD VEHICLE TRANS AND MAINT	1	PA
B1523	HEAD BUILDING SERVICES	1	PA
B1527	HEAD PREVENTIVE MAINT AND INSP	1	PA
B1530	HEAD BUILDING MAINTENANCE	1	PA
B1532	SUPT OF PLANT OPERATIONS & ENG	1	PA
B1540	HOUSE DIRECTOR	1	PA
B1544	RESIDENT MANAGER	1	S
B1545	SR RESIDENT MANAGER	1	PA
B1550	ASST MANAGER OF FAMILY HOUSING	1	PA
B1551	MANAGER OF FAMILY HOUSING	1	PA
B1553	MANAGER CONTRACTS & ASGMTS	1	PA
B1554	MANAGER HOUSING SERVICES	1	PA
B1558	ATHLETIC FACILITY MANAGER	1	PA
B1559	ATHLETIC FACILITIES SUPVR	1	PA
B1691	HEAD SCHED AND CONTROL	1	PA
B1744	GLASS SHOP MANAGER	1	PA
B1752	INSTRUMENT SHOP MANAGER	1	PA
B1774	ELECTRONICS SHOP MANAGER	1	PA
B1807	CARTOGRAPHIC SHOP MANAGER	1	PA
B1839	CHIEF OF MEDICAL PHOTOGRAPHY	1	PA
B1906	COORD OF INST INFORMATION	1	F
B3205	CURATOR	1	PA
B3210	HEAD LIBRARY MEDIA CENTER	1	PA
B4485	CHIEF OF STAFF	1	PA
B4501	ASST HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATOR I	1	PA
B4502	ASST HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATOR II	1	PA
B4504	HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATOR	1	PA
B4509	NURSING HOME ADMINISTRATOR	1	PA
B4615	COOPERATIVE EXTENSION ADMIN	1	PA
B4620	COUNTY EXTENSION DIRECTOR	1	PA
B4630	DIST EXTENSION HEAD	1	PA
B4700	DIST AGENT - 4-H AND YOUTH	1	PA
B4701	DIST AGENT - HOME ECONOMICS	1	F
B4702	DIST AGENT - AG & NAT RES	1	PA
B4703	DIST AGENT - COMM & RURAL DEV	1	PA
B4704	STATE HOME ECONOMIST LEADER	1	PA
B4740	STATE 4-H CLUB LEADER	1	PA

B4742	ASSOC STATE 4-H CLUB LEADER	1	PA
B4749	DIST 4-H CLUB LEADER	1	PA
B4801	ATHLETIC DIRECTOR	1	PA
B4802	ASST ATHLETIC DIRECTOR	1	PA
B4803	ASSOC ATHLETIC DIRECTOR	1	PA
B4804	ATHLETIC PROMOTION DIRECTOR	1	PA
B4810	HEAD COACH	1	PA
B4822	HEAD FOOTBALL RECRUITER	1	PA
B4843	SPORTS INFORMATION DIRECTOR	1	PA
B4850	HEAD BASEBALL COACH	1	PA
B4853	HEAD SOFTBALL COACH	1	PA
B4855	HEAD BASKETBALL COACH	1	PA
B4860	HEAD FOOTBALL COACH	1	PA
B4870	HEAD GOLF COACH	1	PA
B4871	ASST GOLF COACH	1	PA
B4873	HEAD TRACK COACH	1	PA
B4875	HEAD TENNIS COACH	1	PA
B4877	VOLLEYBALL COACH	1	PA
B4878	WRESTLING COACH	1	PA
B4881	HEAD SWIMMING COACH	1	PA
B4883	GYMNASTIC COACH	1	PA
B4885	WOMEN'S TRACK COACH	1	PA
B4890	WOMEN'S BASKETBALL COACH	1	PA
B6001	DIRECTOR STUDENT AFFAIRS	1	PA
B6002	ASSOC DIRECTOR STUDENT AFFAIRS	1	PA
B6004	ASST DIRECTOR STUDENT AFFAIRS	1	PA
B6101	REGISTRAR	1	PA
B6102	ACTING REGISTRAR	1	PA
B6103	REGISTRAR EMERITUS	1	PA
B6107	ASSOC REGISTRAR	1	PA
B6108	ASST REGISTRAR	1	PA
B6150	DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS	1	PA
B6152	ASSOC DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS	1	PA
B6155	ASST DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS	1	PA
B6160	DIRECTOR OF ADM AND TESTING	1	PA
B7040	COORD - UNIV SYST INFO	1	PA
B7041	COORD-INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH	1	PA
B7101	DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B7103	INTERIM DIRECTOR-ADMIN	1	PA
B7104	ASSOC DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B7105	ASST DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B7106	CO DIRECTOR	1	PA
B7107	DIRECTOR OF BUDGETS	1	PA
B7108	ASST DIRECTOR OF BUDGETS	1	PA
B7110	EXECUTIVE DIR ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B7120	ASSOC TO THE DIR - ADMIN	1	PA
B7122	ASST TO THE DIRECTOR - ADMIN	1	PA
B7201	DIV HEAD ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B7202	ASST DIV HEAD-ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B7220	DEPT MGR ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B7222	ASST DEPARTMENT MGR ADMIN	1	PA
B7230	UNIT HEAD	1	PA
B7247	ASST DIRECTOR OF FACILITIES	1	PA
B7250	RSCH STATION SUPERINTENDENT	1	PA
B7260	PROJECT DIRECTOR	1	PA
B7268	CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER	1	PA
B7810	ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL ASSOC	1	PA
B7815	ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL	1	PA
B7820	SENIOR ACADEMIC PROFESSIONAL	1	PA
B8001	DEAN ACADEMIC	1	F
B8002	ACTING DEAN ACADEMIC	1	F
B8003	DEAN EMERITUS ACADEMIC	1	F
B8004	DEAN OF THE COLLEGE	1	F
B8008	DEAN, ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B8009	SENIOR ASSOC DEAN ACADEMIC	1	F
B8010	ASSOC DEAN ACADEMIC	1	F
B8020	ASST DEAN ACADEMIC	1	F
B8030	ASST TO THE DEAN ACADEMIC	1	F
B8035	ASSOC TO THE DEAN	1	F
B8060	DEAN OF PUBLIC RELATIONS	1	PA
B8070	DEAN STUDENT AFFAIRS	1	PA

B8071	ASSOC DEAN ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B8072	ASSOC DEAN STUDENT AFFAIRS	1	PA
B8074	ASST DEAN ADMINISTRATIVE	1	PA
B8075	ASST DEAN STUDENT AFFAIRS	1	PA
B8101	DIRECTOR ACADEMIC	1	F
B8102	DIRECTOR - RESEARCH	1	F
B8105	SENIOR ASSOC DIRECTOR-ACADEMIC	1	F
B8110	ASSOC DIRECTOR-ACADEMIC	1	F
B8111	ASSOC DIRECTOR-RESEARCH	1	F
B8120	ASST DIRECTOR-ACADEMIC	1	F
B8121	ASST DIRECTOR-RESEARCH	1	F
B8201	DIV CHAIRPERSON ACADEMIC	1	F
B8205	DIV CHAIRPERSON-INSTRUCTOR	1	F
B8206	DIV CHAIRPERSON-ASST PROF	1	F
B8207	DIV CHAIRPERSON-ASSOC PROF	1	F
B8208	DIV CHAIRPERSON-PROF	1	F
B8209	DIV CHAIRPERSON-EMERITUS	1	F
B8215	ACT DIV CHAIRPERSON-INSTRUCTOR	1	F
B8216	ACT DIV CHAIRPERSON-ASST PROF	1	F
B8217	ACT DIV CHAIRPERSON-ASSOC PROF	1	F
B8218	ACT DIV CHAIRPERSON-PROF	1	F
B8301	DEPT HEAD ACADEMIC	1	F
B8302	ASSOC DEPARTMENT HEAD ACADEMIC	1	F
B8305	DEPT HEAD-INSTRUCTOR	1	F
B8306	DEPT HEAD-ASST PROF	1	F
B8307	DEPT HEAD-ASSOC PROF	1	F
B8308	DEPT HEAD-PROF	1	F
B8309	DEPT HEAD-EMERITUS	1	F
B8315	ACT DEPT HEAD-INSTRUCTOR	1	F
B8316	ACT DEPT HEAD-ASST PROF	1	F
B8317	ACT DEPT HEAD-ASSOC PROF	1	F
B8318	ACT DEPT HEAD-PROF	1	F
B9001	CHANCELLOR	1	PA
B9002	EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR	1	PA
B9004	EXECUTIVE ASST TO CHANCELLOR	1	PA
B9005	SPECIAL ASST TO CHANCELLOR	1	PA
B9006	ASSISTANT TO THE CHANCELLOR	1	PA
B9007	SENIOR VC ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	1	PA
B9008	SENIOR VC CAPITAL RESOURCES	1	PA
B9009	SENIOR VC HUMAN & EXTERNAL AFF	1	PA
B9010	VICE CHANCELLOR-ACADEMIC AFF	1	PA
B9011	VC HUMAN RESOURCES & LEGAL AFF	1	PA
B9012	VICE CHANCELLOR-EXTERNAL AFF	1	PA
B9013	VICE CHANCELLOR-FACILITIES	1	PA
B9014	VC - INFO/INSTR TECH	1	PA
B9015	VC - STUDENT SERVICES	1	PA
B9016	VC-PLANNING & POLICY ANALYSIS	1	PA
B9019	ASSOC VC INFORMATION TECH/CIO	1	PA
B9020	ASSOC VC ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	1	PA
B9021	ASSOC VC FISCAL AFFAIRS	1	PA
B9022	ASSOC VC HUMAN RESOURCES	1	PA
B9023	ASSOC VC LEGAL AFFAIRS	1	PA
B9024	ASSOC VC PLANNING & POLICY ANL	1	PA
B9025	ASST VC ACADEMIC AFFAIRS	1	PA
B9026	ASST VC ACCOUNTING	1	PA
B9027	ASST VC BUDGETS	1	PA
B9028	ASST VC DEV & ECON SRVCS	1	PA
B9029	ASST VC FACILITIES	1	PA
B9030	ASST VC INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	1	PA
B9031	ASST VC INSTRUCTIONAL TECH	1	PA
B9032	ASST VC LEGAL AFFAIRS	1	PA
B9033	ASST VC MEDIA & PUBLICATIONS	1	PA
B9034	ASST VC PLANNING	1	PA
B9040	EXECUTIVE SECRETARY	1	PA
B9042	ASST EXECUTIVE SECRETARY	1	PA
B9045	ASST TO EXECUTIVE SECRETARY	1	PA
B9055	BENEFITS ADMINISTRATOR	1	PA
B9056	DIRECTOR PERSONNEL MGMT	1	PA
B9101	PRESIDENT	1	F
B9102	ACTING PRESIDENT	1	F
B9103	PRESIDENT EMERITUS	1	F

B9104	SR FACULTY ADVISOR TO THE PRES	1	F
B9106	EXECUTIVE ASST TO THE PRES	1	F
B9107	ASST TO THE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9108	EXEC DIRECTOR FOR LEG AFFAIRS	1	F
B9110	LEGAL ADVISOR TO THE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9111	ASSOC LEG ADVISOR TO THE PRES	1	F
B9120	PROVOST	1	F
B9121	ASSOC PROVOST	1	F
B9122	VICE PROVOST	1	F
B9123	ASST VICE PROVOST	1	F
B9124	ASSOC TO THE PROVOST	1	F
B9125	ASST TO THE PROVOST	1	F
B9127	SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9129	EXEC VICE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9130	VICE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9131	ACTING VICE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9132	VICE PRESIDENT EMERITUS	1	F
B9133	ASSOC VICE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9134	ASST VICE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9135	SR ASSOC VICE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9137	ASST TO THE VICE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9141	ACTING ASST VICE PRESIDENT	1	F
B9150	EXECUTIVE SEC TO FOUNDATION	1	PA
B9201	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OFFICER	1	PA
B9204	MINORITY PROCUREMENT COORD	1	PA
B9301	TREASURER	1	PA
B9302	ASST TREASURER	1	PA
B9320	COMPTROLLER	1	PA
B9322	ASSOC COMPTROLLER	1	PA
B9324	ASST COMPTROLLER	1	PA
B9326	DEPUTY COMPTROLLER	1	PA

Table 2
FTE Students Per
Executive/Administrative Managerial Staff
as Reported to IPEDS, 1999-2000

INSTITUTION NAME	TOTAL FTE ENROLLMENT	TOTAL EXEC/ADMIN/MGRL STAFF	RATIO FTE ENROLLMENT TO EXECUTIVE STAFF	PERCENT OF SYSTEM AVERAGE RATIO	IPEDS REPORTING METHOD*	
1 GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	14,966	547	27	48.9%	ALL EEO-1	
2 SAVANNAH STATE UNIVERSITY	2,003	54	37	66.3%	SELECTIVE	
3 COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY	4,268	92	46	82.9%	ALL EEO-1	
4 GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY	2,189	47	47	83.2%	SELECTIVE	Below
5 ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY	3,011	63	48	85.4%	ALL EEO-1	4-Year
6 VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	8,080	168	48	85.9%	ALL EEO-1	Average
7 UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	29,782	579	51	91.9%	ALL EEO-1	Ratio
8 CLAYTON COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	3,506	64	55	97.9%	SELECTIVE	
9 AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	4,277	71	60	107.6%	ALL EEO-1	
10 FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY	2,447	38	64	115.0%	ALL EEO-1	Above
11 KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY	10,444	162	64	115.2%	ALL EEO-1	4-Year
12 GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	20,107	270	74	133.0%	ALL EEO-1	Average
13 MACON STATE COLLEGE	2,557	33	77	138.4%	ALL EEO-1	Ratio
14 STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA	7,113	90	79	141.2%	ALL EEO-1	
15 GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	12,952	152	85	152.2%	ALL EEO-1	
16 GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	4,354	46	95	169.1%	ALL EEO-1	
17 NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	3,163	31	102	182.2%	UNKNOWN	
18 ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY	4,366	17	257	458.8%	SELECTIVE	
19 DALTON STATE COLLEGE	1,996	5	399	713.1%	SELECTIVE	
FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTION TOTALS AND AVERAGES	141,581	2,529	56			
1 BAINBRIDGE COLLEGE	809	22	37	44.2%	SELECTIVE	
2 WAYCROSS COLLEGE	593	12	49	59.3%	ALL EEO-1	
3 COASTAL GEORGIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1,212	21	58	69.3%	ALL EEO-1	Below
4 ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE	2,104	32	66	79.0%	SELECTIVE	2-Year
5 MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE	1,593	23	69	83.2%	ALL EEO-1	Ratio
6 ATLANTA METROPOLITAN COLLEGE	1,640	22	75	89.5%	SELECTIVE	Average
7 EAST GEORGIA COLLEGE	855	12	71	85.6%	SELECTIVE	
8 FLOYD COLLEGE	1,541	18	86	102.8%	ALL EEO-1	
9 GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE	9,877	102	97	116.3%	SELECTIVE	Above
10 SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE	918	10	92	110.2%	SELECTIVE	2-Year
11 GAINESVILLE COLLEGE	2,163	20	108	129.9%	ALL EEO-1	Average
12 GORDON COLLEGE	2,135	20	107	128.2%	ALL EEO-1	Ratio
13 DARTON COLLEGE	1,957	15	130	156.7%	SELECTIVE	
TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION TOTALS AND AVERAGES	27,397	329	83			

Table 3
Ratio of FTE Students to Administrators in SREB States*

	Four-Year Public Colleges/Universities				Two-Year Public Colleges			
	FTE Enrollment	Administrators	Ratio: FTE Students to Administrators	% of Avg.	FTE Enrollment	Administrators	Ratio: FTE Students to Administrators	% of Avg.
SREB	1,803,360	22,034	81.8	100%	1,144,740	5,740	199.4	100%
Alabama	107,840	1,241	86.9	106%	53,688	245	219.1	110%
Arkansas	54,438	455	119.6	146%	26,337	246	107.1	54%
Delaware	21,692	437	49.6	61%	7,985	34	234.8	118%
Florida	185,094	2,496	74.2	91%	234,859	629	373.4	187%
Georgia	141,581	2,529	56.0	68%	27,397	329	83.3	42%
Kentucky	84,206	985	85.5	104%	27,553	121	227.7	114%
Louisiana	131,527	1,734	75.9	93%	20,171	109	185.1	93%
Maryland	81,587	700	116.6	142%	63,340	352	179.9	90%
Mississippi	55,280	470	117.6	144%	45,354	355	127.8	64%
North Carolina	139,410	1,987	70.2	86%	107,270	654	164.0	82%
Oklahoma	77,607	590	131.5	161%	37,861	273	138.7	70%
South Carolina	74,001	678	109.1	133%	53,939	92	586.3	294%
Tennessee	103,249	1,468	70.3	86%	48,753	154	316.6	159%
Texas	341,881	3,398	100.6	123%	305,348	1,693	180.4	90%
Virginia	149,603	2,174	68.8	84%	78,493	418	187.8	94%
West Virginia	54,365	692	78.6	96%	6,394	36	177.6	89%

Note: Georgia ranks second in state general purpose funding/FTE student for two-year colleges. Delaware is #1

Note: Georgia ranks third in state general purpose funding/FTE student for four-year colleges. Maryland and North Carolina are 1 and 2 respectively

* Sources: *SREB Fact Book on Higher Education 2003*, and SREB web-based State Data Exchange. The original source is the National Center for Education Statistics.