

**OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S
ECONOMIC IMPACT ON OAKLAND COUNTY AND THE STATE**

Primary Input Data Spreadsheet

1. College Expenditures:	\$38,106,099
2. Total Student Activity Expenditures:	\$160,298
3. Percentage of College Expenditures --	
a. in sponsor area:	46%
b. in State:	65%
c. out-of-state:	35%
4. Number of College Employees --	
a. full-time:	812
b. part-time:	1,258
c. TOTAL NUMBER:	2,070
d. FTE for above:	1,280
5. College Employees Who Live --	
in sponsoring county (ies) --	
a. full-time:	620
b. part-time:	912
c. TOTAL:	1,532
d. FTE for above:	959
in State--	
a. full-time:	809
b. part-time:	1,256
c. TOTAL:	2,065
d. FTE for above:	1,276
6. Total Disposable Income Available to Employees:	\$29,509,472
7. Number of Students --	
a. full-time:	6,088
b. part-time:	23,275
c. TOTAL:	29,363

8. Average Annual College-related Expenditures by Full-time Students:	\$4,960
9. Average Annual College-related Expenditures by Part-time Students:	\$3,630
10. Revenue From Students:	\$24,683,689
Revenue From Local Governments:	\$23,305,944
State Aid:	\$17,938,787
Revenue From Other Sources Within State:	\$2,515,058
Revenue From Out-of-state Sources:	\$4,411,028

Data Resource Worksheet

For Part D: Estimate of % of Employee Expenditures IN COUNTY (estimated from Sales and Marketing Management Vol. 139 #6):	51.50%
For Part E: Total Number of out-of-County--	
Full-time employees:	192
Part-time employees:	346
Total Number of out-of-State--	
Full-time employees:	3
Part-time employees:	2
Annual Expenditures in Service Area by employees residing out of Service Area--	
Full-time employees expenditures:	\$1,000
Part-time employees expenditures:	\$500
For Part F: Census Data --	
Percentage Who Rent in County:	27.30%
Mean Monthly Rent in County:	\$495
For Part L: Multiplier Effect:	2.00
State Multiplier Effect (Part J):	2.25
For Part P: Multiplier for Jobs related to College: (Regional Multipliers: A User Handbook, US Dept of Commerce, p. 104 RIMS II May 1986)	0.0000401

\$ 68,550,151.

Impact Analysis Spreadsheet for Oakland County

A. Total Student Activity Expenditures in County:	\$73,737
B. College Expenditures in County:	\$17,528,806
C. Total In-County Expenditures by College:	\$17,602,543
D. Disposable Income of In-County Employees Spent In County On Non-housing Items:	\$11,386,161
E. Expenditures Of Out-of-County Employees in County on Non-housing Items:	
a. Full-Time:	\$192,000
b. Part-Time:	\$173,000
F. Rental Expenditures by Full-time College Staff Living in County:	\$1,005,404
G. Total Employee Expenditures:	\$12,756,565
H. Total Expenditures By Full-time Students:	\$30,196,480
I. Total Expenditures by Part-time Students:	\$84,488,250
J. Total Expenditures by Students:	\$114,684,730
K. Total Direct Economic Impact of the College on the County:	\$145,043,838
L. Multiplier Effect:	2.00
M. Total Estimated Economic Impact:	\$290,087,676
N. Full-time Employees Living in County:	959
O. Total Economic Impact of the College in the County:	\$145,043,838
P. Jobs Related to College:	5,816
Q. Total Full-time Employment Related to College:	6,775
R. Ratio of Sponsor Contribution to Total Economic Impact:	\$1.00 to \$12.45

OCC Employees

B 4 + B 20 + B 35 + B 38.

Student- Visitation Expenditures
Capex

Impact Analysis Spreadsheet on Michigan

A. Total Student Activity Expenditures in State:	\$103,392
B. College Expenditures in State:	\$24,578,434
C. Total In-State Expenditures by College:	\$24,681,826
D. Employee Non-housing Expenditures:	\$15,149,886
E. Expenditures Of Out-of-State Employees in State on Non-housing Items:	
a. Full-Time:	\$3,000
b. Part-Time:	\$1,000
F. Rental Expenditures by Full-time College Staff Living in County:	\$1,311,891
G. Total Employee Expenditures:	\$16,465,777
H. Total Expenditures By Full-time Students:	\$114,684,730
I. Total Direct Economic Impact of the College on the State:	\$155,832,333
J. Multiplier Effect:	2.25
K. Total Estimated Economic Impact:	\$350,622,749
L. FTE Living in State:	1,276
M. Jobs Related to College:	6,249
N. Total Full-time Employment Related to College:	7,525

ECONOMIC IMPACT MODEL
MARTIN ORLOWSKI, OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE <MAORLOWS@OCC>

*send
Michael
Casey's
memo
to*

Oakland Community College (Michigan) is embarking on an Economic Impact study. The study will attempt to assess the overall impact the college has upon the local economy. At this point we are interested in learning about any models that are in use or have been used to assess a community college's economic impact. We are especially interested in computer based models that reflect changing conditions within the institution and in the economy.

If you know of any such models and would like to share them with us, please contact:

Press RETURN for more...

MAIL>

#3

1-APR-1992 22:38:01.89

NEWMAIL

Martin A. Orłowski
Director, Institutional Planning and Analysis
Oakland Community College
27055 Orchard Lake Road
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48334
Telephone: (313) 471-7746
Bitnet: MAORLOWS@OCC

Martin-

We opted not to conduct one of these studies, but we did research the various models - see enclosed.

Good luck -

Jane Price

*Franklin + Marshall
College*

Report to: Mike McGuire, Paul Brawley, Jane Price
RE: Economic Impact Studies
From: Michael Casey/Jennifer Matthews

July 11, 1991

Purpose

We have conducted this research based upon the premise that an economic impact study, if it could be done at a reasonable cost in terms of both dollars and manpower, would be a worthwhile endeavor. Given that, the purpose of this initial investigation is fairly narrow: to ascertain the general parameters of conducting an economic impact study - how long to conduct, how much it would cost, how much manpower involved -- and to see whether, given those parameters, F&M could conduct a study within a reasonable time frame and a reasonable cost in terms of dollars and staff.

General Description

An economic impact study determines the economic affect that an institution has on its community, or more specifically, whether the community gains or loses by having the institution located there. A study of F&M's economic impact on Lancaster would detail the new money that the institution brings into the community each year. The vast majority of economic impact studies conducted are based on the Caffrey and Isaacs model. However, there are several options to consider in choosing how to conduct the study. It can be done by the institution independently. It can be done in conjunction with a consultant, and in some cases with community participation. The level of detail, and therefore accuracy, can also vary considerably although the cost rises considerably for a relatively insignificant reduction in the margin for error.

Why Do We Need It?

Essentially, the reasons are economic and political. We would be seeking to bolster the community's perception of F&M as a major asset to Lancaster. Although evidence is anecdotal, it would appear that most non-F&M Lancastrians view the College in a vaguely benign manner with some being slightly negative and others slightly positive. While not a crisis situation, there is obviously considerable room for improvement. Moreover, with the elimination of the Evening Division (or at least its transferral to Lebanon Valley) and the growing distance (publicly) between the North Museum and the College, it seems to be an appropriate time to seek out other means of strengthening ties to the community and solidifying our case. This is particularly true in light of our plans to approach the community for support of the new Athletic Complex. We also have to recognize that Millersville is becoming much more aggressive in its fundraising in the local community.

Our principal audience would include corporations and other individuals whom we would approach for monetary support; government officials and other community leaders with whom we might have seek support for any variety of College initiatives. In presenting the findings of the study, however, we must be careful not to create the impression that economic impact is the college's central mission. We must also identify those expenditures that might provoke more questions than they answer. We must also ensure that the procedures we use are conceptually and procedurally sound and carried out correctly.

The Caffrey and Isaacs Method

The Caffrey and Isaacs Method is by far the most most commonly used. It is designed for a school with few students from the local community. The model compares the college or university to an "export sector of the economy" (Salley 1978: 49). The good

(educating a student) is made in Lancaster and sold to families in other communities. The money brought into the community because of the student is the economic impact. If the student lives in Lancaster and would not have gone to college if F&M did not exist, that student can not be included into the calculations. His/her spending in the community is not F&M related. The Caffrey and Isaacs method works optimally with schools that attract students to their community because of the school. F&M is such a school.

Caffrey & Isaacs determines the economic impact by ascertaining how much money the institution spends on the community or what is called the "direct impact". By using a multiplier, Caffrey & Isaacs determines "how much initial spending (the direct impact) is spread around locally" or reinvested into the community. The reinvestment is called the "indirect impact". It details all campus related expenditures in the community, including general institutional (such as electricity, water, etc.) and faculty (rent, misc., etc.) and student (rent, misc., etc.) expenditures (see attached diagram). Unlike smaller economic impact studies the Caffrey and Isaacs method includes money students bring into the community from their use of local banks.

Notably, Caffrey and Isaacs also looks at factors that would contribute to a negative economic contribution to the community. The fact that F&M has dining services, the Common Ground, Ben's, trash disposal, college store, child care facilities, etc., lessens its economic impact on the community. The method also determines how many services are needed to support the F&M community, i.e. police. Does Lancaster require more police because of F&M, or does campus security personnel off-set the number of police persons that would have been needed? By including the negative impact, other institutions have felt that they bolster the credibility of the report.

Economic Development and Cultural Contributions

Although most institutions do not determine the economic impact of their cultural and developmental contributions to the community, many institutions list them and "pay homage" to their benefits in the report. For example, Carnegie Mellon's report notes the number of high technology firms brought into the community to assist in transferring research from the University to the private sector. Edinboro State College detailed faculty contributions to the community (i.e. volunteers, social activism...), college services (i.e. planetarium, reading clinic...), what they termed "college-related services (i.e. summer camps...)" and recreational facilities (i.e. field house, swimming pool). Although F&M may not chose to include much of its cultural and developmental impact on Lancaster, mentioning these aspects balances economics with contributions that are less tangible.

In-House Study

F&M has the option of conducting the research with F&M personnel. According to the University of Pittsburgh, in-house research is accepted by the community as much as the work of a consultant. After employing a consultant to assist them the first time, they have conducted subsequent surveys on their own. According to Jack Dunn, the key to the perceived legitimacy of an economic impact study is the inclusion of negative impact, including use of roads, public transportation, community parks, police services, etc.

Most other institutions conduct their own study using a committee of campus personnel. The Clarion University of Pennsylvania researched their own economic impact using a professor on campus (Dr. Thomas Vernon) to lead a committee of personnel who gathered data and helped to shape the final report. Dr. Vernon might be able to do consulting work for F&M and is available in the spring. Carnegie Mellon has also conducted the study with their own personnel.

According to Jack Dunn at Tufts University, F&M should be able to do the study without outside help. He thinks that using Caffrey and Isaacs "like a bible", that we should have few problems. Dunn also thinks that the multiplier should be used very cautiously. The multiplier is based on a guess. If a multiplier is used it should be used in a small paragraph, i.e. "if a multiplier was applied to F&M's direct impact the total economic impact would be ___". He warns that F&M should not put this figure in "bold print". He believed that the study could be completed in approximately three weeks by one person. This presupposes using averages already computed, such as the amount of money the financial aid office projects each student to spend during a year, and if the accounts payable can be easily separated into geographic areas.

ALTERNATIVE METHODS

Computer Program

A computer program based on the Caffrey and Isaacs model has been created that will determine the economic impact of the college on the community. The computer model costs \$50 and is sold through Sacramento City College. However, according to one user, Goshen College, the computer program was worthless. At Ohio Wesleyan, which also used the program, the Development Office had never heard of the program, suggesting that the program had perhaps not produced any usable results.

Art Adams

Art Adams of Illinois State University does "mini-economic impact studies". His name and the type of document he produces was included in the original packet of material from Jane Price. The cost of the study is \$750 and would take one month to complete. The actual time period required to complete the report would depend on how much information we want to include in it beyond the information he includes, i.e. student and visitor expenditures, economic development, etc. A note of caution: it appears that he is having what he himself described as "internal problems, losing several members of his staff and his situation appears rather unstable at the moment.

Farnum Alston

Farnum Alston is a consultant with Peat Marwick Company in California. The company has just finished determining the economic impact of University of Berkeley, University of San Francisco and (closer to PA) the Pennsylvania University School of Veterinary Medicine. His method appears similar to Caffrey and Isaacs but focuses considerable attention on cultural and developmental impact. He usually highlights the social activities of the faculty, students and alumni in the area.

If F&M personnel can collect the data and compile the needed information, Alston's fees would probably fall into the \$30,000 - \$40,000. If he does it, the cost could go as high as \$100,000. He is very willing to work with F&M personnel and "key" business people from Lancaster. He thinks that the report is better accepted when community leaders are included in planning the study. The study would take three to four months to complete. This includes time that would be spent on campus in meetings and time when the F&M personnel gathers data. After the report has been written, Alston would present the results to a group of Lancaster leaders and answer and defend the results.

Fletcher Carter

Fletcher Carter does consulting work for different institutions. He has conducted economic impact studies for Radford University and written a guide book on the subject based on Caffrey and Isaacs' work. The book is titled Issues for the Eighties: Economic

Impact Studies for Institutions of Higher Education. Although he has not been a consultant for economic impact studies recently he has done consulting work for Hampton University.

His study method is detailed and in-depth. His consulting work costs \$100 a day with a minimum charge of \$1000, plus travel and expenses. He estimated that he could complete the study for \$2500 including travel and expenses. With the help of F&M personnel, he believes that he would need three days on campus to create the surveys, to direct the committee and to determine where he could find the information needed for computing the economic impact. He said that F&M can gather that information but then said that he could also do it for us but for an additional fee. The information would be gathered in the fall followed by the report in the spring.

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems

Dennis Jones and Peter Ewell are both consultants for NCHEMS. They work with Bob Lisensky, formerly President of Willamette University in Salem, Oregon. They would also follow Caffrey & Isaacs but would also focus on the cultural and developmental impact. They would charge us \$5,600 plus travel expenses to come to Lancaster for two days to develop the basic procedures for compiling the information. "Follow-up work, if any, would be undertaken under terms of a separate agreement."

Strategic Initiatives

Strategic Initiatives builds partnerships between the community and the institution. When they research the economic impact, the process involves the community. Doing the research is part of their approach of improving the relationship. The outcome is not only a number, but a better relationship between the community and the school. The study would take 2-6 months to complete. The cost of the study might be between \$15,000 and \$50,000. Among those working on the report would be Dr. Charles Salley who appears to be the expert on determining multipliers for such studies.

Pennsylvania Economy League

According to Robert Greenwood at PEL, the differences between the PEL method and the Caffrey and Isaacs method are few. PEL determines a multiplier for the institution, whereas Caffrey and Isaacs use an average. Other differences include the fact that the PEL does not include money paid in school tax if there are no children attending school. The PEL has never completed an economic impact study for a college or university. Robert Greenwood sent a copy of Carnegie Mellon's 1990 economic impact on Pittsburgh that was based on the methodological approaches of the PEL but was conducted by the University. In the Carnegie Mellon study, student spending was determined using figures gathered from the Admissions Office rather than using surveys.

Robert Greenwood believed that the economic impact study could be completed in two months with the help of F&M personnel. The PEL is willing to work with a committee from F&M including local business leaders and F&M staff. Methodological meetings might take two days. He estimated that it would take three weeks to obtain the necessary data and the rest of the time would be used for determining the impact and writing the report. Depending on how much detail and help F&M needed, Greenwood believed that the consulting fees would cost "a couple thousand" but would need to meet with us to be more specific.

Gordon Van de Water

Gordon Van de Water of AVA, is a consultant for colleges and universities. The AVA do fiscal analyses for schools interested in establishing new campuses and also economic impact studies. He personally does little work with established colleges and universities. However, AVA has a network of economists (mostly professors) who do

economic impact studies. This person would head a group from AVA to conduct the economic impact study at F&M. The process would entail the AVA team or consultant coming to F&M to meet with a committee of F&M personnel and possibly Lancaster business people. The AVA team would work with the committee to establish the information F&M would like to include in the surveys and help to collect the data. After the data has been collected the committee would send it to the AVA team. The team would process the information and present a preliminary report to the committee. After the report is approved, a final report would be presented to a larger audience. The cost of AVA's consulting work was estimated to be between \$30,000.00 and \$50,000.00. The price becomes higher with the more original data we need from surveys.

Conclusion

We believe that it is possible for F&M to conduct a study with the parameters of "reasonableness" noted above. The course suggested by Jack Dunn appears to be the most likely, although the specifics of the methodology still need to be worked out.

Caffrey, John and Isaacs, Herbert H.

- 1972 Estimating the Impact of a College or University on the Local Economy.
Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Commonwealth of Kentucky Council on Higher Education

- 1987 The economic Impact of Public Universities and Colleges on Kentucky Annual Expenditure Impact.

Daly, Brian E.

- Expenditure Model of Economic Impact of Higher Education: A Statewide Approach. The Kentucky Council on Higher Education.

Kinnick, Mary K.

- 1982 Oregon Community College Economic Impact Study: A Guidebook.
Gresham, Oregon: Office of Research, Mount Hood Community College.

Kinnick, Mary K. and Walleri, R. Dan

- "Economic Impact Studies" from A Primer on Institutional Research. John A. Muffo and Gerald W. McLaughlin (eds.). Association for Institutional Research.

Manahan, Richard A. & Carter, Fletcher F.

- 1979 Issues for the Eighties: Economic Impact Studies for Institutions of Higher Education. San Diego, California: Association for Institutional Research- 19th Annual Forum Workshop.

Oregon Community College Association

- 1986 The Impact of Community Colleges on Oregon's 1985-86 Economy.

Pennsylvania Economy League

- 1981 Higher Education and the Economy: A Survey of the Impacts of Pennsylvania's Economy of its Colleges and Universities. Pennsylvania State Board of Education and the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency.

Prewitt, Sidney; and others

- 1986 Forecasting the Effects of Higher Education Appropriation on Local Economies. Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research. Texas, Association of Institutional Research.

Salley, Charles D.

- 1978 "Calculating the Economic Multiplier for Local University Spending" from Research and Planning for Higher Education. Robert H. Fenske and Paul J. Stasky (eds.). 17th Annual Forum. Montreal, Quebec: The Association for Institutional Research.

SRI International, Public Policy Center

- 1986 The Higher Education-Economic Development Connection: Emerging Roles for Colleges and Universities in a Changing Economy. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Land Grant Universities.

Consultants

Art Adams
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761
(309) 438-7051

Farnum Alston
Peat Marwick
California
(415) 951-7573

Fletcher Carter
Radford University
Radford, Virginia
(703) 831-5134

Dr Manahan
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, Tennessee 37614
(615) 929-5381

National Center for Higher Education Management
Peter Ewell and Dennis Jones
P.O. Drawer P
Boulder Colorado 80301-9752
(303) 497-0301

Don Norris
Strategic Initiative
1370 Pennsylvania Street
Suite 220
Denver, Co. 80203
(703) 450-5255

Pennsylvania Economy League
Robert Greenwood
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
(717)234-3151

Norval Wellsfry
Sacramento City College
Sacramento, California
(916) 449-7568

Gordon Van de Water
AVA
1370 Pennsylvania Street
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 832-3444

Johnson
10/13/92.

Total Institutional Expenditures	\$39,040,679.00
Percent of expenditures in Oakland County	46.00%

Total institutional expenditures in Oakland county	\$17,958,712.34
--	-----------------

College Employees

Employees total disposable income	\$29,509,472.00
Total institutional employees	2070
Total institutional employees in Oakland county	1532
Percent employees in Oakland county	74.01%
Percent non-housing expenditures for Oakland county	69.53%
Percent residents expenditures in Oakland county	51.50%
Employees non-housing expenditures in Oakland county	\$7,820,406.31
Total full-time employees	812
Full-time employees in Oakland county	620
Non-housing expenditures of full-time out-of-county employees	\$192,000.00
Percent of Oakland county residents who rent	27.30%
Average annual Oakland county rent	\$5,940.00
Rental expenditures of full-time employees in Oakland county	\$1,005,404.40
Total employees expenditures in Oakland county	\$9,017,810.71

Students

Number of full-time students	6088
Number of part-time students	23275
Number of students in on-campus housing	0
Average annual room & board expenses in on-campus housing	\$0.00
Annual room & board expenses for all students in on-campus housing	\$0.00
Average annual room & board expenses for full-time students in off-campus housing	\$4,700.00
Number of full-time students living in off-campus housing	6088
Annual room & board expenditures for all full-time students living off campus	\$28,613,600.00
Average annual non-housing education related expenditures for full-time students	\$4,268.00
Average annual non-housing education related expenditures for part-time students	\$2,050.00

Total non-housing education related expenditures for full-time students	\$25,983,584.00
Total non-housing education related expenditures for part-time students	\$47,713,750.00
Total students expenditures	\$102,310,934.00

Visitors

Total visitors expenditures	\$0.00
-----------------------------	--------

Total direct economic impact on Oakland county	\$129,287,457.05
Total economic impact upon Oakland county	\$258,574,914.09
Total indirect economic impact on Oakland county	\$129,287,457.05
Full-time jobs related to OCC in Oakland county	9050
Total full-time employment related to OCC in Oakland county	9862
Total local taxes received	\$22,910,927.00
Total state taxes received	\$17,913,684.00
Total taxpayer investment	\$40,824,611.00
Return on taxpayer investment	6.33

OCC.
Economic Impact Study
Final Numbers of 10-23-92

Prepared By	WJL	Date
Approved By		

WILSON JONES COMPANY

07101 Cincinnati, Ohio

MADE IN U.S.A.

			Total
1	Total Expenses (From 04/02/92)	96,907,691.10	96,907,691.10
2	Less Payroll:		
3	Fund 01 (from 04/02/92)	554,147,767	
4	All other Funds - per 04/02/92 "PAYROLL"	339,011,475	
5	Total PIR Exp.		588,015,242
6	Total		38,106,098.68
7			
8	Student Expenditures (Taken from A1/B)		
9	Student services 01-11630-xxx taken from A1/B	345,516,241	
10	Agency Fund 91-xxxx-xxx Taken from A1/B	118,267,211	
11			463,783,452
12	PIR Student Services	30,320,688	
13	PIR Agency Fund	216,403	
14			30,348,571
15	Total Student		1,602,977,741
16			
17	* Total Local Taxes		233,059,444.99
18	* Total State Appropriations		179,387,867.79
19	* Total Student Tuition/Fees		246,836,885.00
20	* Revenue From Other Sources w/in State: Grants + Donations	Grants 1,680,589,866 Donations 834,468,211	2,515,058,077
21	* Revenue from out of State		441,110,278.00
22			
23	* Figures taken from audit work papers:		

OCC
Economic Impact Study
Fiscal Year Number: 8-92-92

Prepared By	Initials	Date
Approved By		

4804 4 COL - 8804 4 COL

Encumbered Expended Total

1	Total Expenses from 080027 (see Attached)	221969054	9409831818	9631800872
2				
3	Less Payroll:			
4	Fund 01 - from 080005 (see Attached)	<25456>	5396531385	
5	Fund 02 to 04		0	
6	Fund 05 to 12		35268945	
7	Fund 13 to 20		11964379	
8	Fund 21 to 37		41210126	
9	Fund 38		57016523	
10	Fund 42 to 91		85767033	
11	Total PIR Expenses	<25456>	572758391	572758391
12				
13	Total			894067937

Fund 02 thru 91 info was taken from
exp reports downloaded to QPRO - see files.

* Student Expenditures

22	Student Services 01-1030-xxx		34240003	
23	Agency Fund 91-xxxx-xxx		11651302	
24				45891305
26	PIR-Student Services		29814342	
27	PIR-Agency Fund		229989	
28				30044331
30	Total			15846974

* Student expenditures were downloaded
from CofS - See QPRO files for detail.

35	Total Local Taxes Received			2291092716
37	Total State Appropriations			1791368425
39	Total Student Tuition/Fees			2671558990

Economic Impact Study
Preliminary Numbers at 8-12-92

Prepared By	Initials	Date
Approved By		

4804 4 COL. - 8804 4 COL.

	1	2	3	4
		Encumbered	Expended	Total
1	Total Expenses from OAC027 (see Attached)	221969054	9409831818	9631800872
2				
3	Less Payroll:			
4	Fund 01 - from OAC005 (see Attached)	<25456>	5396531385	
5	Fund 02 to 04		0	
6	Fund 05 to 12		35268945	
7	Fund 13 to 20		11964379	
8	Fund 21 to 37		141210126	
9	Fund 38		57016523	
10	Fund 42 to 91		85767033	
11	Total PIR Expenses	<25456>	5727758391	5727732935
12				
13	Total			3904067937
14				
15	Fund 02 thru 91 info was taken from			
16	expb reports downloaded to QPRO - see files.			
17				
18				
19				
20	<u>* Student Expenditures</u>			
21				
22	Student Services 01-1630-XXX		34240003	
23	Agency Fund 91-XXXX-XXX		11651302	
24				45891305
25				
26	PIR-Student Services		29814342	
27	PIR-Agency Fund		229989	
28				30044331
29				
30	Total			15846974
31	* Student expenditures were downloaded			
32	from Cufs - see QPRO files for detail			
33				
34				
35	Total Local Taxes Received			2291092716
36	- Cufs REVA report.			
37				
38				
39				
40				

OCC
Economic Impact Study
Preliminary Numbers as of 8-12-92

Prepared By	Initials	Date
Approved By		

4804 4 COL - 8804 4 COL

	Encumbered	Expended	Total
1 Total Expenses from OAC037 (see Attached)	221969054	9409831818	9631800872
2			
3 Less Payroll:			
4 Fund 01 - from OAC005 (see Attached)	<25456>	5396531385	
5 Fund 02 to 04		0	
6 Fund 05 to 12		35268945	
7 Fund 13 to 20		11964379	
8 Fund 21 to 37		141210126	
9 Fund 38		57016323	
10 Fund 42 to 91		85767033	
11 Total PIR Expenses	<25456>	5127758391	5127732935
12			
13 Total			904067937

Fund 02 thru 91 info was taken from
exp reports downloaded to QPRO - see files.

* Student Expenditures

22 Student Services 01-1430-XXX		34240003	
23 Agency Fund 91-XXXX-XXX		11651302	
24			45891305
25			
26 PIR-Student Services		29814342	
27 PIR-Agency Fund		229989	
28			30044331
29			
30 Total			15846974

* Student expenditures were downloaded
from CUS - see QPRO files for detail

35 Total Local Taxes Received			2291092716
36 T CUS REVA reports			

202-523-0586 Regional Economic Analysis Division
ref Carmen Pigler

State Multiplier. 2.0127.

but. health group

Where do we find county multiplier?

Higher education multiplier broken out of health?

Jobs Multiplier. Johnson ref Courtney + Kraus - .00007 Full-time jobs
per dollar added.

Sue Beattie

1582

OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
JOHNSON IMPACT STUDY
JAMESTOWN ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY

1

13:56 Thursday, August 6, 1992

JOHNSON IMPACT STUDY

	FULL TIME	PART TIME	TOTAL
19-3 OCC HEAD COUNT	812	1,258	2,070
19-4 IN COUNTY HEAD-COUNT	620	912	1,532
19-5 DISPOSIBLE INCOME		\$29,509,472.41	

JAMESTOWN IMPACT STUDY

	FULL TIME	PART TIME	TOTAL	FTE
A1-4 OCC HEAD COUNT	812	1,258	2,070	1,280. 1,279.79 ? Highs ?
A1-5 IN COUNTY HEAD COUNT	620	912	1,532	957.38 ?
A1-5 MICHIGAN HEAD COUNT	809	1,256	2,065	1,274.92
A1-6 DISPOSIBLE INCOME		\$29,509,472.41		

JOHNSON IMPACT STUDY

JAMESTOWN ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY

SPECIFICATION FOR EMPLOYEE COUNTS

IN THE PAYROLL DATA BASE, EMPLOYEES ARE CLASSIFIED BY STATUS AND SUB-STATUS.

01 CONTRACT

- A ADMINISTRATORS
- F FACULTY FULL-TIME
- E OPERATING ENGINEERS
- N MANAGEMENT STAFF
- S FACULTY PART-TIME

02 CLASSIFIED

- C CLASSIFIED
- P PUBLIC SAFETY

03 MAINTENANCE

- M MAINTENANCE

04 PART-TIME HOURLY

- H HOURLY PART-TIME
- D PERMANENT/PART-TIME

05 WORK STUDY

- W WORK STUDY

1) QUESTION 2A ON PAGE 19.

PURPOSE: TOTAL PERCENT OF EXPENDITURES FROM 1991-92 GENERAL FUND BUDGE (ACTUALS) PAID TO OAKLAND COUNTY BASED VENDORS.

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. OAKLAND COUNTY ZIP CODE TABLE
2. EXPENSE DATA SOURCE TO BE DETERMINED

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. SELECT ALL
2. CREATE A SUB SET OF OAKLAND COUNTY DETERMINED BY ZIP CODE

OUTPUT:

1. TOTAL EXPENDITURE AMOUNT
2. PERCENT OF EXPENDITURE TO OAKLAND COUNTY VENDORS

2) QUESTION 4 ON PAGE 19.

PURPOSE: COUNT OF FULLTIME EMPLOYEES WHO LIVE IN OAKLAND COUNTY AND PART-TIME EMPLOYEES (INCLUDING STUDENTS) WHO LIVE IN OAKLAND COUNTY.

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. PAYROLL DATA BASE
2. ADDRESS DATA BASE
3. OAKLAND COUNTY ZIP CODE TABLE

SELECTION CRITERIA:

A. ADDRESS DATA BASE

1. ZIP CODE FOUND IN ZIP CODE TABLE

B. PAYROLL DATA BASE

1. ZIP CODE FOUND IN ZIP CODE TABLE
2. CURRENTLY ACTIVE
3. SUB STATUS EQUAL TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING
FULL-TIME SUB-STATUSES - A E N F C M P
PART-TIME SUB-STATUSES - S H D W

OUTPUT:

1. TOTAL HEADCOUNT FULL-TIME
2. TOTAL HEADCOUNT PART-TIME
3. TOTAL HEADCOUNT ALL

3) QUESTION 5 ON PAGE 19.

PURPOSE: TOTAL AMOUNT OF SPENDABLE INCOME (NET PAY + ANNUITIES + CREDIT UNION DEDUCTIONS) PAID TO OCC EMPLOYEES IN THE CALENDAR YEAR 1991.

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. PAYROLL DATA BASE AS OF 12/31/91

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. CURRENTLY ACTIVE
2. YTD-GROSS PAY - (YTD-FEDERAL + YTD-STATE + YTD-CITY + YTD-FICA TAXES)

OUTPUT:

1. TOTAL DISPOSABLE INCOME OF ALL ACTIVE EMPLOYEES

1) QUESTION 3 ON PAGE A1.

PURPOSE:

1. TOTAL PERCENT OF AMOUNT EXPENDED IN COUNTY
2. TOTAL PERCENT OF AMOUNT EXPENDED IN STATE
3. TOTAL PERCENT OF AMOUNT EXPENDED OUT-OF-STATE

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. ZIP CODE FOUND IN ZIP CODE TABLE
2. EXPENSE DATA SOURCE TO BE DETERMINED

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. SELECT ALL
2. CREATE AN AMOUNT EXPENDED IN OAKLAND COUNTY DETERMINED BY ZIP CODE
3. CREATE AN AMOUNT EXPENDED IN MICHIGAN INCLUDING OAKLAND COUNTY
4. CREATE AN AMOUNT EXPENDED OUT-OF-STATE

OUTPUT:

1. PERCENT OF EXPENDITURE TO OAKLAND COUNTY VENDORS
2. PERCENT OF EXPENDITURE TO MICHIGAN VENDORS INCLUDING OAKLAND COUNTY
3. PERCENT OF EXPENDITURE TO OUT-OF-STATE VENDORS

3) QUESTION 4 ON PAGE A1.

PURPOSE: HEADCOUNT OF EMPLOYEES

SOURCE OF DATA:

A. PAYROLL DATA BASE

B. FULL-TIME HOURS = 2080 PER HEAD EXCEPT FULL TIME FACULTY

PART-TIME HOURS = YTD REGULAR HOURS + YTD OVERTIME HOURS EXCEPT
PART-TIME FACULTY

C. FACULTY AND PARTIME FACULTY 'FTE' = 680.4

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. CURRENTLY ACTIVE

2. SUB STATUS EQUAL TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING

FULL-TIME SUB-STATUSES - A E N F C M P

PART-TIME SUB-STATUSES - S H D W

OUTPUT:

1. TOTAL HEADCOUNT FULL-TIME

2. TOTAL HEADCOUNT PART-TIME

3. TOTAL HEADCOUNT ALL

4. 'FTE' FOR ABOVE

3) QUESTION 5 ON PAGE A1.

PURPOSE: HEADCOUNT OF EMPLOYEES BY RESIDENCE IN COUNTY, IN STATE.

SOURCE OF DATA:

- A. ADDRESS DATA BASE
- B. ZIP CODE TABLE
- C. PAYROLL DATA BASE

SELECTION CRITERIA:

- 1. CURRENTLY ACTIVE
- 2. SUB STATUS EQUAL TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING
FULL-TIME SUB-STATUSES - A E N F C M P
PART-TIME SUB-STATUSES - S H D W
- 3. STATE = MICHIGAN
- 4. SUB SET OF EMPLOYEES WITH ZIP CODE FOUND IN ZIP CODE TABLE

OUTPUT:

TOTAL HEADCOUNTS IN OAKLAND COUNTY

- 1. TOTAL HEADCOUNT FULL-TIME
- 2. TOTAL HEADCOUNT PART-TIME
- 3. TOTAL HEADCOUNT ALL
- 4. 'FTE' FOR ABOVE

TOTAL HEADCOUNTS IN MICHIGAN INCLUDING OAKLAND COUNTY

- 1. TOTAL HEADCOUNT FULL-TIME
- 2. TOTAL HEADCOUNT PART-TIME
- 3. TOTAL HEADCOUNT ALL
- 4. 'FTE' FOR ABOVE

PURPOSE: TOTAL AMOUNT OF SPENDABLE INCOME (NET PAY + ANNUITIES + CREDIT UNION DEDUCTIONS) PAID TO OCC EMPLOYEES IN THE CALENDAR YEAR 1991.

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. PAYROLL DATA BASE AS OF 12/31/91

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. CURRENTLY ACTIVE
2. GROSS PAY - (FEDERAL + STATE + CITY + FICA TAXES)

OUTPUT:

1. TOTAL DISPOSABLE INCOME OF ALL ACTIVE EMPLOYEES

OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 JOHNSON IMPACT STUDY
 JAMESTOWN ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY

1

15:43 Tuesday, September 1, 1992

JOHNSON IMPACT STUDY

19-2 PERCENT OF OCC EXPENDITURES IN OAKLAND COUNTY 45.7%

	FULL TIME	PART TIME	TOTAL
19-3 OCC HEAD COUNT	812	1,258	2,070
19-4 IN COUNTY HEAD-COUNT	620	912	1,532
19-5 DISPOSIBLE INCOME	\$29,509,472.41		

JAMESTOWN IMPACT STUDY

A1-3 PERCENT OF OCC EXPENDITURES IN COUNTY IN STATE OUT-OF-STATE
 45.7% 65.1% 34.9%

	FULL TIME	PART TIME	TOTAL	FTE
A1-4 OCC HEAD COUNT	812	1,258	2,070	1,279.79
A1-5 IN COUNTY HEAD COUNT	620	912	1,532	957.38
A1-5 MICHIGAN HEAD COUNT	809	1,256	2,065	1,274.92
A1-6 DISPOSIBLE INCOME	\$29,509,472.41			

JOHNSON IMPACT STUDY
JAMESTOWN ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY
SPECIFICATION FOR EMPLOYEE COUNTS

IN THE PAYROLL DATA BASE, EMPLOYEES ARE CLASSIFIED BY STATUS AND SUB-STATUS.

- 01 CONTRACT
 - A ADMINISTRATORS
 - F FACULTY FULL-TIME
 - E OPERATING ENGINEERS
 - N MANAGEMENT STAFF
 - S FACULTY PART-TIME

- 02 CLASSIFIED
 - C CLASSIFIED
 - P PUBLIC SAFETY

- 03 MAINTENANCE
 - M MAINTENANCE

- 04 PART-TIME HOURLY
 - H HOURLY PART-TIME
 - D PERMANENT/PART-TIME

- 05 WORK STUDY
 - W WORK STUDY

JOHNSON IMPACT STUDY

PAGE 1

1) QUESTION 2A ON PAGE 19.

PURPOSE: TOTAL PERCENT OF EXPENDITURES FROM 1991-92 GENERAL FUND BUDGE (ACTUALS) PAID TO OAKLAND COUNTY BASED VENDORS.

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. OAKLAND COUNTY ZIP CODE TABLE
2. EXPENSE DATA SOURCE IS CUFS GENLED FOR 1991-92

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. EXCLUDE
 - A. DISTRIBUTION GROUPS 1, 2, 8, AND 90
 - B. VENDOR CODES BEGINNING WITH '1'
2. INCLUDE
 - A. OBJECT CODES = '21'
 - B. ACCOUNT TYPE = '22', '23', '24'
 - C. FUND = '01'
3. CREATE A SUB SET OF OAKLAND COUNTY DETERMINED BY ZIP CODE
4. WHERE THERE ARE MULTIPLE ADDRESSES, THE DEFAULTS ARE OAKLAND COUNTY ZIP CODES FOLLOWED BY STATE = MICHIGAN FOLLOWED BY OUT-OF-STATE.
EXCEPTIONS ARE KNOWN VENDORS WHERE THEIR PAY ADDRESS IS OUT OF STATE.

OUTPUT:

1. PERCENT OF EXPENDITURE TO OAKLAND COUNTY VENDORS

JOHNSON IMPACT STUDY

PAGE 2

2) QUESTION 4 ON PAGE 19.

PURPOSE: COUNT OF FULLTIME EMPLOYEES WHO LIVE IN OAKLAND COUNTY AND PART-TIME EMPLOYEES (INCLUDING STUDENTS) WHO LIVE IN OAKLAND COUNTY.

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. PAYROLL DATA BASE
2. ADDRESS DATA BASE
3. OAKLAND COUNTY ZIP CODE TABLE

SELECTION CRITERIA:

A. ADDRESS DATA BASE

1. ZIP CODE FOUND IN ZIP CODE TABLE

B. PAYROLL DATA BASE

1. ZIP CODE FOUND IN ZIP CODE TABLE
2. CURRENTLY ACTIVE
3. SUB STATUS EQUAL TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING
FULL-TIME SUB-STATUSES - A E N F C M P
PART-TIME SUB-STATUSES - S H D W

OUTPUT:

1. TOTAL HEADCOUNT FULL-TIME
2. TOTAL HEADCOUNT PART-TIME
3. TOTAL HEADCOUNT ALL

JOHNSON IMPACT STUDY

PAGE 3

3) QUESTION 5 ON PAGE 19.

PURPOSE: TOTAL AMOUNT OF SPENDABLE INCOME (NET PAY + ANNUITIES + CREDIT UNION DEDUCTIONS) PAID TO OCC EMPLOYEES IN THE CALENDAR YEAR 1991.

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. PAYROLL DATA BASE AS OF 12/31/91

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. CURRENTLY ACTIVE
2. YTD-GROSS PAY - (YTD-FEDERAL + YTD-STATE + YTD-CITY + YTD-FICA TAXES)

OUTPUT:

1. TOTAL DISPOSABLE INCOME OF ALL ACTIVE EMPLOYEES

JAMESTOWN IMPACT STUDY

PAGE 4

1) QUESTION 3 ON PAGE A1.

PURPOSE:

1. TOTAL PERCENT OF AMOUNT EXPENDED IN COUNTY
2. TOTAL PERCENT OF AMOUNT EXPENDED IN STATE
3. TOTAL PERCENT OF AMOUNT EXPENDED OUT-OF-STATE

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. OAKLAND COUNTY ZIP CODE TABLE
2. EXPENSE DATA SOURCE IS CDFS GENLED FOR 1991-92

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. EXCLUDE
 - A. DISTRIBUTION GROUPS 1, 2, 8, AND 90
 - B. VENDOR CODES BEGINNING WITH '1'
2. INCLUDE
 - A. OBJECT CODES = '21'
 - B. ACCOUNT TYPE = '22', '23', '24'
 - C. FUND = '01'
3. CREATE AN AMOUNT EXPENDED IN OAKLAND COUNTY DETERMINED BY ZIP CODE
4. CREATE AN AMOUNT EXPENDED IN MICHIGAN INCLUDING OAKLAND COUNTY
5. CREATE AN AMOUNT EXPENDED OUT-OF-STATE

OUTPUT:

1. PERCENT OF EXPENDITURE TO OAKLAND COUNTY VENDORS
2. PERCENT OF EXPENDITURE TO MICHIGAN VENDORS INCLUDING OAKLAND COUNTY
3. PERCENT OF EXPENDITURE TO OUT-OF-STATE VENDORS

JAMESTOWN IMPACT STUDY

PAGE 5

3) QUESTION 4 ON PAGE A1.

PURPOSE: HEADCOUNT OF EMPLOYEES

SOURCE OF DATA:

- A. PAYROLL DATA BASE
- B. FULL-TIME HOURS = 2080 PER HEAD EXCEPT FULL TIME FACULTY
PART-TIME HOURS = YTD REGULAR HOURS + YTD OVERTIME HOURS EXCEPT
PART-TIME FACULTY
- C. FACULTY AND PARTIME FACULTY 'FTE' = 680.4

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. CURRENTLY ACTIVE
2. SUB STATUS EQUAL TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING
FULL-TIME SUB-STATUSES - A E N F C M P
PART-TIME SUB-STATUSES - S H D W

OUTPUT:

1. TOTAL HEADCOUNT FULL-TIME
2. TOTAL HEADCOUNT PART-TIME
3. TOTAL HEADCOUNT ALL
4. 'FTE' FOR ABOVE

JAMESTOWN IMPACT STUDY

PAGE 6

3) QUESTION 5 ON PAGE A1.

PURPOSE: HEADCOUNT OF EMPLOYEES BY RESIDENCE IN COUNTY, IN STATE.

SOURCE OF DATA:

- A. ADDRESS DATA BASE
- B. ZIP CODE TABLE
- C. PAYROLL DATA BASE

SELECTION CRITERIA:

- 1. CURRENTLY ACTIVE
- 2. SUB STATUS EQUAL TO ONE OF THE FOLLOWING
FULL-TIME SUB-STATUSES - A E N F C M P
PART-TIME SUB-STATUSES - S H D W
- 3. STATE = MICHIGAN
- 4. SUB SET OF EMPLOYEES WITH ZIP CODE FOUND IN ZIP CODE TABLE

OUTPUT:

TOTAL HEADCOUNTS IN OAKLAND COUNTY

- 1. TOTAL HEADCOUNT FULL-TIME
- 2. TOTAL HEADCOUNT PART-TIME
- 3. TOTAL HEADCOUNT ALL
- 4. 'FTE' FOR ABOVE

TOTAL HEADCOUNTS IN MICHIGAN INCLUDING OAKLAND COUNTY

- 1. TOTAL HEADCOUNT FULL-TIME
- 2. TOTAL HEADCOUNT PART-TIME
- 3. TOTAL HEADCOUNT ALL
- 4. 'FTE' FOR ABOVE

PURPOSE: TOTAL AMOUNT OF SPENDABLE INCOME (NET PAY + ANNUITIES + CREDIT UNION DEDUCTIONS) PAID TO GCC EMPLOYEES IN THE CALENDAR YEAR 1991.

SOURCE OF DATA:

1. PAYROLL DATA BASE AS OF 12/31/91

SELECTION CRITERIA:

1. CURRENTLY ACTIVE
2. GROSS PAY - (FEDERAL + STATE + CITY + FICA TAXES)

OUTPUT:

1. TOTAL DISPOSABLE INCOME OF ALL ACTIVE EMPLOYEES

Total Institutional Expenditures	\$21,934,558.00
Percent of expenditures in Oakland County	54.90%

Total institutional expenditures in Oakland county	\$12,042,072.34
--	-----------------

College Employees

Employees total disposable income	\$15,072,215.00
Total institutional employees	1756
Total institutional employees in Oakland county	1606
Percent employees in Oakland county	91.46%
Percent non-housing expenditures for Oakland county	75.85%
Percent residents expenditures in Oakland county	56.32%
Employees non-housing expenditures in Oakland county	\$5,888,658.12
Total full-time employees	587
Full-time employees in Oakland county	535
Non-housing expenditures of full-time out-of-county employees	\$52,000.00
Percent of Oakland county residents who rent	32.71%
Average annual Oakland county rent	\$4,428.00
Rental expenditures of full-time employees in Oakland county	\$774,893.36
Total employees expenditures in Oakland county	\$6,715,551.48

Students

Number of full-time students	3161
Number of part-time students	8003
Number of students in on-campus housing	0
Average annual room & board expenses in on-campus housing	\$0.00
Annual room & board expenses for all students in on-campus housing	\$0.00
Average annual room & board expenses for full-time students in off-campus housing	\$3,330.00
Number of full-time students living in off-campus housing	3161
Annual room & board expenditures for all full-time students living off campus	\$10,526,130.00
Average annual non-housing education related expenditures for full-time students	\$2,455.00
Average annual non-housing education related expenditures for part-time students	\$925.00

Total non-housing education related expenditures for full-time students	\$7,760,255.00
Total non-housing education related expenditures for part-time students	\$7,402,775.00
Total students expenditures	\$25,689,160.00

Visitors

Total visitors expenditures	\$0.00
-----------------------------	--------

Total direct economic impact on Oakland county	\$44,446,783.82
Total economic impact upon Oakland county	\$100,005,263.60
Total indirect economic impact on Oakland county	\$55,558,479.78
Full-time jobs related to OCC in Oakland county	3111
Total full-time employment related to OCC in Oakland county	3698
Total local taxes received	\$25,843,282.00
Total state taxes received	\$6,659,326.00
Total taxpayer investment	\$32,502,608.00
Return on taxpayer investment	3.08

Jamestown Model

Survey form

1. H. Kieba
2. H. Kieba
3. ITS from CUFS
4. Planning & Analysis
5. ITS from payroll system
6. ITS through CUFS
7. Planning & Analysis
8. Planning & Analysis from Financial Aif
9. Planning & Analysis from Financial Aif
10. H. Kieba

Detailed worksheet

- Part D: Planning & Analysis
Part E:

Johnson County Community College (model)

SQ=Survey Questions 1-14.

1. ACS/IPEDS financial reports. (Kendall, Kieba)
2. CUFS Vendor table? Kieba.
3. Payroll, W-2 forms, (HR).
4. Payroll records, (HR).
5. Payroll, W-2 forms (HR).
6. Planning & Analysis (Fall 1991=29,084. Full-time=6,197, Part-time=22,887
7. Zero.
8. Zero.
9. IPEDS, Financial Aid formula. (Planning & Analysis).
10. IPEDS, Financial Aid formula. (Planning & Analysis).
11. IPEDS, Financial Aid formula. (Planning & Analysis).
12. Job applicants e.g. CUFS object code "CANDIDATE" + sport camps + workshops, seminars held at OCC + Art exhibitions, Blue Grass festival....
13. Taxes. Kieba or Jatson.
14. Taxes, Kieba or Jarson.

Worksheert

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES ON SPONSOR COUNTIE

SURVEY FORM
Sample College

1. College Expenditures:	\$39,040,679	_____
2. Total Student Activity Expenditures:	\$158,469	_____
3. Percentage of College Expenditures --		
a. in sponsor area:	46%	
b. in State:	65%	
c. out-of-state:	35%	
4. Number of College Employees --		
a. full-time:	812	
b. part-time:	1,258	
c. TOTAL NUMBER:	2,070	
d. FTE for above:	1,280	
5. College Employees Who Live --		
in sponsoring county (ies) --		
a. full-time:	620	
b. part-time:	912	
c. TOTAL:	1,532	
d. FTE for above:	959	
in State--		
a. full-time:	809	

Economic Impact Study

b. part-time:	1,256
c. TOTAL:	2,065
d. FTE for above:	1,276
 6. Total Disposable Income Available to Employees:	<u>\$29,509,472</u>
 7. Number of Students --	
a. full-time:	6,088
b. part-time:	23,275
c. TOTAL:	29,363
 8. Average Annual College-related Expenditures by Full-time Students:	\$4,960
 9. Average Annual College-related Expenditures by Part-time Students:	\$3,630
 10. Revenue From Students:	\$26,715,589
Revenue From Local Governments:	\$22,910,927
State Aid:	\$17,913,684
Revenue From Other Sources Within State:	\$2,081,424
Revenue From Out-of-state Sources:	\$4,199,629

+ 40,824,611.

PRELIMINARY DATA FOR DETAIL WORKSHEET

For Part D: Estimate of % of Employee Expenditures IN COUNTY
 (estimated from Sales and Marketing Management Vol. 139 #6): 51.50%

For Part E: Total Number of out-of-County--

Economic Impact Study

Full-time employees: 192
 Part-time employees: 346

Total Number of out-of-State--
 Full-time employees: 3
 Part-time employees: 2

Annual Expenditures in Service Area by employees residing
 out of Service Area--
 Full-time employees expenditures: \$1,000
 Part-time employees expenditures: \$500

For Part F: Census Data --
 Percentage Who Rent in County: 27.30%
 Mean Monthly Rent in County: \$495

For Part L: Multiplier Effect: 2.00
 State Multiplier Effect (Part J): 2.25

For Part P: Multiplier for Jobs related to College: 0.0000700
 (Regional Multipliers: A User Handbook,
 US Dept of Commerce, p. 104 RIMS II May 1986)

COUNTYWIDE DATA FOR INDIVIDUAL COLLEGE
 Sample College

A. Total Student Activity Expenditures in County: \$72,896 *B13 x B10. Rounded.*
 B. College Expenditures in County: \$17,958,712 *B13 x Survey 1.*

Economic Impact Study

C. Total In-County Expenditures by College:	\$18,031,608	B 93 + B 95.
D. Disposable Income of In-County Employees Spent In County On Non-housing Items:	\$11,386,161	B 37 x (B 29 ÷ B 21.) x DAT. 1.
E. Expenditures Of Out-of-County Employees in County on Non-housing Items:		
a. Full-Time:	\$192,000	B 65 x B 74.
b. Part-Time:	\$173,000	B 66 x B 75.
F. Rental Expenditures by Full-time College Staff Living in County:	\$1,005,404	B 26 x B 78 x B 79 x 12.
G. Total Employee Expenditures:	\$12,756,565	B 100 + B 105 + B 106 + B 109
H. Total Expenditures By Full-time Students:	\$30,196,480	B 40 x B 45
I. Total Expenditures by Part-time Students:	\$84,488,250	B 41 x B 48.
J. Total Expenditures by Students:	\$114,684,730	B 113 + B 115.
K. Total Direct Economic Impact of the College on the County:	\$145,472,903	B 97 + B 111 + B 117.
L. Multiplier Effect:	2.00	
M. Total Estimated Economic Impact:	\$290,945,806	B 122 x B 120.
N. Full-time Employees Living in County:	959	B 29.
O. Total Economic Impact of the College in the County:	\$145,472,903	B 120.

Economic Impact Study

P. Jobs Related to College:	10,183	B 84 x B 120 .
Q. Total Full-time Employment Related to College:	11,142	B 126 + B 130 .
R. Ratio of Sponsor Contribution to Total Economic Impact:	\$1.00 to \$12.70	B 124 ÷ B 51 .

STATEWIDE DATA FOR INDIVIDUAL COLLEGE
Sample College

A. Total Student Activity Expenditures in State:	\$102,213	B 124 ÷ B 51 . B 14 x B 10 .
B. College Expenditures in State:	\$25,181,238	B 14 x SURVEY 1 .
C. Total In-State Expenditures by College:	\$25,283,451	B 142 + B 144 .
D. Employee Non-housing Expenditures:	\$15,149,886	B 21 = 0 B 35 ÷ B 21 x B 87 x DATA 1 .
E. Expenditures Of Out-of-State Employees in State on Non-housing Items:		
a. Full-Time:	\$3,000	B 69 x B 74 .
b. Part-Time:	\$1,000	B 70 x B 75 .
F. Rental Expenditures by Full-time College Staff Living in County:	\$1,311,891	B 32 x B 78 . x B 79 x 12 .
G. Total Employee Expenditures:	\$16,465,777	B 908 ÷ 158 ÷ 1 B 148 + B 153 + 154 + 157 .

Economic Impact Study

H. Total Expenditures By Full-time Students:	\$114,684,730	B117 + DATABASE 2+ 3+4.
I. Total Direct Economic Impact of the College on the State:	\$156,433,958	B82
J. Multiplier Effect:	2.25	
K. Total Estimated Economic Impact:	\$351,976,406	B166 X DATA 5.
L. FTE Living in State:	1,276	B35.
M. Jobs Related to College:	10,950	DATA 5 X B84.
N. Total Full-time Employment Related to College:	12,226	DATA 7 * B172.
