residents of the state. However, by fiscal year 2013 Arizona was allocating just $3.57 per $1,000 of personal income—a reduction of 41.5 percent when controlling for the change in personal income. By contrast, Illinois and Wyoming both provided double-digit percentage increases in their higher education appropriations per $1,000 in personal income, meaning that higher education funding grew faster than personal income during the period. North Dakota represents an entirely different case. Its booming economy has grown substantially, so although its real appropriations for higher education increased significantly, funding for higher education didn’t increase proportionately to the increase in personal income within the state. Take a look at table H to see how your state stacked up, and use those figures as evidence in advocating for a restoration of higher education funding.

Much of the tuition price increase in public higher education over the last several years has been a direct consequence of reductions in state appropriations. As states have abdicated their responsibility for ensuring access to postsecondary education, students and their families have been forced to bear more of the costs in the form of higher tuition prices. Because good jobs migrate to the locations with the best-educated workforces, states such as Arizona, New Hampshire, Louisiana, Alabama, Florida, and California may be retarding their future rates of growth for decades to come.

PUBLIC-PRIVATE SALARY DIFFERENCES

The declining state appropriations for higher education have already had consequences. As we documented in this report last year, increases in faculty salaries are not the reason for rapid tuition price increases during the last decade. Indeed, average full-time faculty salaries, adjusted for inflation, actually decreased at public master’s-granting institutions and community colleges and increased by less than 1 percent at public doctoral universities and baccalaureate colleges over the decade. Public colleges and universities, reeling from immediate and long-term cutbacks in their state funding, have sought to reduce spending on the backs of their students, increasingly substituting lower-paid contingent faculty members for more fairly paid tenure-track faculty members. Further budget tightening has come in the form of lower starting salaries and smaller annual salary increases for faculty members employed in the public sector, which has led to a widening salary disadvantage for the 70 percent of faculty members who work there.

The gap between public- and private-sector salaries has been a regular topic of this report. We thought it would be useful to present the most recent data in a slightly different way, one that we hope is easily understandable. Figures 2 through 4 show how much less faculty members in the public sector are earning, by academic rank and institutional category, focusing on the last