

Working Papers on University Reform

Working Paper 16:

FOLLOW THE MONEY

An interim report on Danish University funding
prepared for Dansk Magisterforening

By Rebecca Boden and Susan Wright

Danish School of Education,
University of Aarhus

October 2010

Title: *FOLLOW THE MONEY. An interim report on Danish University funding prepared for Dansk Magisterforening*

Authors: Rebecca Boden and Susan Wright

Published by: EPOKE, Department of Education, Aarhus University, 2010

© 2010, the writers

1. Edition

ISBN: 978-87-7684-931-3

Working Papers on University Reform
Series Editor: Susan Wright

This working papers series is published by the research programme 'Education, Policy and Organisation in the Knowledge Economy' (EPOKE) at Department of Education, Aarhus University. The series brings together work in progress in Denmark and among an international network of scholars involved in research on universities and higher education.

EPOKE aims to establish the study of universities as a field of research in Denmark. The field has three components:

- 1. Inter/national policies to develop a global knowledge economy and society – their global travel and local negotiation*
- 2. New forms of organisation – their migration between private and public sectors, including universities, and their pedagogies*
- 3. University teaching, research and knowledge dissemination, as shaped by these organisational and policy contexts.*

Central questions include: How are different national and transnational visions of learning societies, knowledge economies, and new world orders spurring reforms to the role and purpose of universities and to the policies and practices of higher education? How do reforms of universities and other knowledge organisations introduce new rationalities of governance, systems of management and priorities for research and teaching? How do managers, academics, employees and students negotiate with new discourses, subject positions and forms of power within these changing organisational and policy contexts? How are their work practices changing, in terms of the politics of knowledge, conduct of research and pedagogy?

EPOKE draws together ideas and approaches from a range of academic fields – anthropology, comparative education, ethnology, history, the history of ideas, political science and sociology – and collaborates internationally with other higher education research centres. EPOKE holds seminars and there is a mailing list of academics and students working in this field in Denmark and internationally.

Further information on EPOKE, current projects, and other working papers in the series are at <http://edu.au.dk/forskning/omraader/epoke/>. To join the mailing list, hold a seminar or have material included in the working paper series please contact professor Susan Wright at suwr@dpu.dk or at the Department of Education, Aarhus University, Tuborgvej 164, 2400 Copenhagen NV, Denmark.

FOLLOW THE MONEY

**An interim report on Danish University funding prepared for Dansk
Magisterforening**

by

REBECCA BODEN
Professor of Critical Management
University of Wales Institute Cardiff
Tel.: +
Email:

and

SUSAN WRIGHT
Professor of Educational Anthropology
Danish School of Education, Århus University
Tel.: + 45 8888 9179
Email: suwr@dpu.dk

Copyright:
Rebecca Boden and Susan Wright

Contents

<i>Introduction</i>	4
<i>Data</i>	5
<i>Income</i>	6
<i>Expenditure</i>	6
<i>Staffing</i>	9
<i>Trends in assets and liabilities</i>	10
<i>Conclusion</i>	11

Introduction

This study commenced because of the concerns of the academic union, Dansk Magisterforening (DM) that, whilst the income of universities appeared to have grown rapidly between 2005 and 2009, in the experience of many academics, this had not translated into more resources for teaching and research.

The study therefore aimed to 'Follow the Money' to determine what the overall patterns of income and expenditure between 2005 and 2009 had been.

This short study looked at the publicly available financial data on Danish Universities between 2005 and 2009. During that period nine government research institutes were fused with universities and four smaller universities were fused with larger ones. There are now eight universities in Denmark, representing the original 21 organisations. The details and dates of the mergers are shown in Table 1.

The data presented here are, for the sake of simplicity, a snapshot comparison of the years 2005 and 2009; these years adequately frame a period of substantial change in Danish higher education. The principal features of the changes are:

Corporatisation: The 2003 University Law changed the status of universities to 'self-owning institutions', which were to be run by a Governing Board and appointed (and upwardly accountable) managers. At the same time, universities were required to change to business methods of accrual accounting.

Government commitment to additional funding. On the grounds that the above changes restored political trust in universities, the Globalisation Strategy promised increased funding to enable universities' research and teaching to drive Denmark's efforts to remain one of the richest countries in the world in the global knowledge economy. Funding was to be based increasingly on outputs, performance and competition.

Fusions. Without government funding and with minimal planning, a major merger of institutions produced three large universities containing two-thirds of Denmark's research and education. Among the best resourced in Europe, they were to produce research synergies, collaborate with industry, provide government services and gain high international ranking.

This interim report is intended to stimulate debate about the effects of these transformations in higher education. It will be followed by further, more detailed, analysis in the coming months.

In an interim report on a study of an entire system it is not possible to discuss each institution in detail. In essence, this is an overview and each institution will, no doubt, have its own explanations of its place within these patterns. Nevertheless, there is

great value in gaining a 'big picture' approach as it will focus attention on pertinent issues.

The statistical work on this project was primarily undertaken by Professor Rebecca Boden. Professor Susan Wright provided the necessary contextual and policy inputs. The authors gratefully acknowledge the work of the research assistant, Ms Jodi Chin and also DM for their financial support. This work is, however, that of Professors Boden and Wright.

Data

Data was collected from two principal sources:

1. Annual financial reports and accounts published by the 21 organisations for 2005 and 2009
2. Statistical data for each university for 2005 and 2009 ('Universiteternes statistiske beredskab') published by Danske Universiteter (DU or Universities Denmark).

Wherever possible, the data from all the fused organisations has been merged to create a composite picture for 2005. Thus, for instance, the figures presented for Copenhagen University include the Danish University of Pharmaceutical Science and the Royal Veterinarian & Agricultural School. This was a straightforward matter where the fusions were only between pre-existing universities as the data was in a common format, for the most part.

Fusions involving research institutes proved more problematic in terms of assembling the picture for 2005 as the data was not in a common format. This affects the Danish Technical University the most. To a lesser extent it also affects Aarhus University, University of Southern Denmark, and Aalborg University. However, the comparatively small-scale of the fused research institutes means that for universities other than DTU these problems are less likely to have a distorting effect.

All monetary figures in the tables presented here are in thousands of Kroner. All years are calendar years ending 31 December. There are a number of rounding differences throughout the data and hence some figures may not look as if they match with others, and this is exacerbated by the large scale of the sums involved. Nevertheless, the figures provide useful indicators of trends and patterns.

In seeking to 'Follow the Money' the study addressed four principal areas:

- Income changes
- Expenditure patterns
- Staffing patterns
- Trends in assets and liabilities

Income

Table 2 is based on the financial reports and accounts of Danish universities and research institutes and shows the changes in their total reported income between 2005 and 2009. The values are not adjusted for inflation.

All institutions have enjoyed significant total aggregated funding increases from a range of sources (state, private and investment income) during the period. The ranked list is:

Institution	% increase
DTU	58
AU	52
SDU	46
ITU	35
CBS	35
KU	33
AAU	31
RUC	25

These funding increases represent a significant opportunity for Danish higher education to make significant contributions to social, economic and cultural well-being of Denmark through teaching and research work.

However, the effectiveness of such increased money will be contingent upon the manner in which funding is used. It is further worth considering the extent to which the extensive fusions of the institutions should have helped them to achieve efficiency savings. Whilst this was not an explicitly stated objective of the fusion process, it is generally expected that merging institutions will bring efficiency savings, especially in administration and management costs (but also to a limited extent in teaching, by reducing duplication of teaching efforts between institutions and by involving staff from research institutes in teaching).

Expenditure

Table 3 shows the changes in expenditure patterns in Danish universities between 2005 and 2009.

University financial officers' allocation of costs between different headings is often more of an art than a science – in the busy and confused world of organisations it is not always possible to categorise things accurately. It is not clear from the statistics how the categories are defined and applied within and between institutions.

In 2005, data under DU's headings was not available for the fused research institutes (for 2009 they are of course included in the global figures). In order to ensure a realistic picture, the research institutes are excluded from Table 3 and the expenditure

under each heading is calculated as a *proportion of the total expenditure for that particular year*. Thus, it is possible to see how the proportions of the total spent under each heading have varied between 2005 and 2009. The fusion of the research institutes might account for some shifts – for instance, in the increase in research expenditure as a proportion of total expenditure (from 36.29% in 2005 to 40.41% in 2009). But our reasonable expectation is that the fusions of the research institutes could not account for an increase in the proportion spent on administration, as the research institutes would have had similar administrative cost patterns to universities in 2005 (or perhaps, because there were fewer students etc, even lower administrative costs).

Teaching expenditure has declined as a proportion of expenditure between 2005 and 2009 (from 27.32% to 22.93%). Three things may account for this. First, as noted above, the fusions with the research institutes have skewed the work of the universities more towards research. Second, universities have worked hard at achieving additional funding for research, further altering the balance between teaching and research. And finally, student numbers have not changed appreciably throughout this period. Research, in contrast, has increased as a proportion of total spend from 32.32% to 36.07% (or from 36.29% to 40.41% if administration costs are included, as in Table 3).

The category ‘administration’ spans a wide range of activities. Teaching and research work and the provision of estates and services require administrative support. Academics need librarians, laboratory technicians and other support staff. Universities need accountants and legal staff. Thus, comparisons with other sorts of organisations, whether in the public or commercial sectors, have to be treated with caution because academics do require more technical support for their work than, say, school teachers or lawyers and accountants.

That said, globally, higher education has in recent years experienced a considerable expansion in such staff and particularly those who now ‘manage’ (a comparatively new concept in higher education). In the Danish context, the reforms of the last decade are marked by a significant degree of corporatisation and the emergence of a cadre of managers. In the UK and USA studies indicate that such groups are experiencing considerable salary increases – a corporate salary to accompany a new corporate identity. Evidence in Denmark points to the same trend.

Table 3 shows that, as a proportion of expenditure for each year, *central* administration has increased from 6.8% to 8.42% of total spend. If central administration costs had remained at 6.8% of total expenditure, universities could have had available some 36 million Kroner to spend on frontline work such as teaching and administration. Assuming an annual salary of 557,000 Kroner this is equivalent to 65 ‘lektor’ posts.¹

¹ The figure of 557,000 Kroner was in 2009 the average pay including pensions for a ‘lektor’ as used for bargaining purposes by both the government and the unions. This figure is not an average for all full time VIPs, and certainly not for part time VIPs. The increase in numbers of VIPs has been especially among PhDs and others on fixed term contracts, whereas the ‘lektor’ is a permanent teaching and research post. By using an average lektor’s salary, our calculation understates the number of extra VIPs that could have been employed if administration costs had not gone up in proportion to other costs.

Table 4 shows similar data to Table 3, but the figures for expenditure on administration include all administration: central administration, teaching administration, research administration and estates administration. This is the fairest basis of comparison as different institutions have different organisational structures (some being more centralised than others).

As before, data under these headings were not available for the fused research institutes for 2005 (for 2009 this component is part of the global figures). In order to ensure a like-for-like comparison, research institutes are excluded from Table 4 and the proportion of expenditure under each heading is calculated as a proportion of the total expenditure for the year (as in Table 3).

Here it can be seen that total administration costs have increased from 22.35% of total 2005 expenditure to 24.22% of total 2009 expenditure. This is a small increase in the proportion of total expenditure dedicated to administration in percentage terms. But the significant increase in the size of Danish universities' income means that, in cash terms, this is a very significant 415.6 million Kroner. Put simply, if administration had been pegged at the same proportion of total expenditure as in 2005, then in 2009 Danish universities would have had an additional 415.6 million Kroner to spend on frontline services such as teaching and research. Again, assuming an annual salary of 557,000 Kroner, this is equivalent to 746 'lektor' posts.

In sum, the overall picture of expenditure revealed in Tables 3 and 4 is one of an increasing proportion of expenditure being devoted to research. In 2005 some 10.9% of total research expenditure was on research administration, and in 2009 this had fallen to 10.7%.² That is, research administration had become a smaller part of the research budget. However, research administration has become a larger proportion of the total expenditure of universities – from 4% in 2005 to 4.33% in 2009 (see Table 5).

Tables 3 and 4 also reveal that expenditure on teaching as a proportion of total budgets fell quite significantly. This may reflect the shifting focus of universities' work towards research, whereas student numbers have not changed appreciably throughout this period. According to the Ministry's University and Property Agency there were 68,174 full time students in 2005 and 73,495 in 2009, and if universities' appropriations per student are indexed at 100 for 2005 they had only risen to 105 for 2009.³ However, as can be inferred from Tables 3 and 4, in 2005 universities spent 19.4% of their total teaching budget on teaching-related administration, whilst in 2009 this had risen to 25%. So universities are spending less on teaching, as a proportion of their total spend, and, within that, a greater amount of the money spent on teaching goes towards administration. Teaching-related administration was 5.3% of universities' total expenditure in 2005 and 5.73% in 2009 (see Table 5).

² Calculated from DU figures.

³ Source: The University Evaluation 2009, Background Papers. Theme D: Research Freedom, D5 'Development in the taximeter for education 2003-2009' <http://www.ubst.dk/institutioner-og-okonomi/universitetsevalueringen-i-2009/baggrundsmateriale/D1-D5%20Freedom%20in%20research.pdf>

Tables 3 and 4 reveal an escalating level of expenditure on administration. Central administration now takes 8.42% of total university expenditure – up from 6.8% in 2005 (Table 3). This is to be expected when universities corporatise – they are likely to begin building up significant cadres of centralised staff.

The only area where administration has fallen proportionately is in buildings and estates. This accounted for 6.3% of total spend in 2005 and 5.74% in 2009 (Table 5). Were it not for a reduction in this area, the rising administrative bills for teaching, research and central administration would have had a much more significant effect, as Table 5 reveals. That is, reductions in costs in estates have mitigated the effects of rises elsewhere. Total administrative costs other than buildings and estates as a proportion of total expenditure have increased from 16.06% to 18.48%. This is equivalent to 538.8m Kroner or, at our assumed annual salary of 557,000 Kroner, some 967 ‘lektor’ posts.

Tables 6 to 13 give the individual data for each university and Table 14 summarises the changes in administrative costs revealed in Tables 6 to 13. The penultimate column to the right shows the additional costs (or, in one case, savings) made as a result of the increases/decreases in the proportion of total expenditure devoted to administration. In the last column to the right we have translated this sum into the number of ‘lektor’ posts (at our assumed rate of 557,000 Kroner per annum) that these sums equate to.

Staffing

Of course, a substantial part of university expenditure is on salaries. Universities employ highly skilled workers and this is reflected in the salary profiles.

Table 15 shows staffing changes between VIPs and TAPs at each university between 2005 and 2009. Again, because of data availability/comparability issues, the staff at the research institutes is excluded from this data. DTU is obviously the institution most affected by this – it shows the largest increase in TAPs but this is probably due, in no small part, to the fusions with the research institutes.

This data shows that there has been a 27% increase in the number of TAPs employed in central administration between 2005 and 2009. Fusions with research institutes fail to adequately account for this rise: for instance, there is a rise of 28% at KU, 48% at CBS and 76% at ITU (none of which fused with research institutes). Central administration TAPs increased by 45% at SDU (which merged with just one research institute) and 62% at AU (which fused with two research institutes).

Total TAPs also increased by 36.2% between 2005 and 2009. In contrast, full time VIPs increased by 35.5% and part time VIPs by just 5.7%.

By 2009 TAPs represented some 46.7% of university staff, up from 45.9% in 2005.

There is additional evidence that a number of senior managers in institutions are starting to enjoy very considerable salaries. Table 16 shows the administrative costs of each university divided by the number of TAPs (this can be taken as a rough proxy for salary costs). Of note is the variation between the increase (and in the case of DTU, decrease) in the costs per TAP employed – from a 38.8% increase in the case of KU to -19% in the case of DTU. Again, DTU's position may be explained by the number of fusions with research institutes.

Forsker Forum has recently published (October 2010, number 238) data on senior salaries which indicates that these are now considerable. The average rektor's salary is in the region of 1.5 million Kroner. To act as a comparison, the Prime Minister of the UK is paid 1.2 million Kroner.

Trends in assets and liabilities

Table 17 shows the balance sheet position of each Danish university at 2005 and 2009, listing their assets and liabilities. It can be seen that all universities have enjoyed a considerable strengthening of their balance sheet position as judged by their net worth (all assets minus all liabilities). The exact causes of this are not yet clear to us. It may be a mixture of the acquisition of assets and the revaluation of assets in line with market values. This requires further investigation.

The 'acid test' of liquidity is simple: it is the current assets (i.e. things that can readily be converted into cash) divided by current liabilities (i.e. liabilities that must be met within one year). This gives a measure of liquidity – the extent to which the organisation can meet its immediate debts from immediately available assets.

As can be seen, Danish universities have very few liquidity problems. A ratio of 1:1 (i.e. the capacity to pay off all current liabilities almost immediately) is obviously very healthy, but may signify an overly-prudent approach to cash-management – money is best deployed to support organisational objectives, not sitting in the bank. Some institutions have a better than 1:1 ratio, implying that they could pay all of their immediate debts and have cash to spare.

In a sense, these high net worth, highly liquid institutions are in an extremely strong position financially. Corporatised autonomous institutions will have a natural tendency to wish to accumulate wealth because this enhances autonomy. However, consideration should be given to the fact that this is, in very large measure, public money which might, in current times, be better spent invested in the enhancement of teaching and research, the core functions of the institutions.

Conclusion

The overall picture that emerges from this analysis is:

1. The total income of Danish universities has risen by 42% between 2005 and 2009.
2. Teaching expenditure has declined as a proportion of total expenditure between 2005 and 2009 (from 27.32% to 22.93%).
3. Research expenditure as a proportion of total expenditure has risen from 36.29% in 2005 to 40.41% in 2009.
4. Central administration has increased from 6.8% of total spend in 2005 to 8.42% of total spend in 2009. Total costs of support and administration (central administration plus administration of research, teaching, buildings which may be decentralised in faculties) have increased from 22.35% of total 2005 expenditure to 24.22% of total 2009 expenditure. This increase is even greater, up from 16.06% to 18.48% of total expenditure when estates and buildings are excluded. That is, the increases in central, teaching and research administration are mitigated by the decreases in estates and buildings administration.
5. When the total for administration costs is divided by the total number of TAPs (a rough proxy for the trend in TAPs pay) this shows that the average cost per TAP rose from 395,000 Kroner in 2005 to 464,000 Kroner in 2009. This implies that the increase in expenditure on administration is not simply because more TAPs are employed, but because some are employed on very high salaries. The average cost per TAP has risen by 20-38% at 5 universities, whilst it has dropped by 19% at DTU.
6. If total administration and support in 2009 had been kept at the same proportion of total expenditure as in 2005, in 2009 Danish universities would have had an additional 1.87% out of a total turnover of 22,222.9m Kroner, i.e. 415.6 m Kroner to spend on core functions of teaching and research (equivalent to 746 'lektor' posts).
7. Universities have built up an extremely strong position financially both in terms of net worth and liquidity. Wealth accumulation enhances the autonomy of corporate institutions, but an alternative would be to spend more of this public money on core functions of teaching and research.

TABLE 1: ORGANISATIONS IN THE DANISH UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH INSTITUTE SECTORS		
Current institution	Merged universities (2007)	Merged research institutions (2008)
Copenhagen University (KU)	Danish University of Pharmaceutical Science (DFU) The Royal Veterinarian & Agricultural School (V&A)	
Aarhus University (AU)	Aarhus Business School (ASB) Danish Pedagogical University (DPU)	Danish Institute of Agricultural Sciences (DIAS) National Environmental Research Institute (NERI)
University of Southern Denmark (SDU)		National Institute of Public Health (NIPD)
Roskilde University (RUC)		
Aalborg University (AAU)		Danish Building Research Institute (DBRI)
Danish Technical University (DTU)		Risø National Laboratory Danish Institute for Food and Veterinary Research (DIFVR) Danish National Space Centre (DNSC) Danish Institute for Fisheries Research (DIFR) Danish Transport Research Institute (DTRI)
Copenhagen Business School (CBS)		
IT University of Copenhagen (ITU)		

TABLE 2: TOTAL INCOME, DANISH UNIVERSITIES 2005-2009 (Thousand Kroner)				
	2009		2005	% increase
Copenhagen University				
DFU			241736	33
V&A			1165807	
KU	7077175		3918565	
Totals	7077175		5326108	
Aarhus University				
ASB			345,804	52
DPU			293,209	
DIAS			316,308	
NERI			129,200	
AU	5,304,576		2,413,590	
Totals	5,304,576		3,498,111	
Southern Denmark				
NIPD			32,000	46
SDU	2,264,428		1,514,317	
Totals	2,264,428		1,546,317	
Roskilde	707,350		564,528	25
Aalborg University				
DBRI			66,183	31
AU	1,907,563		1,385,282	
Totals	1,907,563		1,451,465	
Danish Technical University				
RISO			260,600	58
DIFVR			243,015	
DNCS			18,900	
DIFR			133,183	
DTRI			7,730	
DTU	3,794,105		1,733,717	
Totals	3,794,105		2,397,145	
ITU	191,520		141,647	35
CBS	1,127,530		832,396	35
Total all income	22,374,247		15,757,717	42

Source: Financial reports and accounts

		Research including administration	Teaching including administration	Dissemination including administration	Research institute work including administration	Central administration	Buildings including administration	Total	
	2005	5280211	3975985	869260	0	989210	3436709	14551375	
	2009	8979413	5096114	799803	763189	1870997	4713417	22222933	
Increase		3699202	1120129	-69457	763189	881787	1276708	7671558	
% change		70.06	28.17	-7.99		89.14	37.15	52.72	
% of total 2005		36.29	27.32	5.97		6.80	23.62		
% of total 2009		40.41	22.93	3.60		8.42	21.21		

Source: Dansk Universiteter

TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF DANISH UNIVERSITIES' EXPENDITURE (Thousand Kroner)								
		Research excluding administration	Teaching excluding administration	Dissemination	Research institute work	All administration	Buildings excluding administration	Total
Total	2005	4702479	3205564	869260	0	3252244	2521826	14551373
Total	2009	8016260	3823221	799803	763189	5383263	3437197	22222933
Increase		3313781	617657	-69457	763189	2131019	915371	7671560
% change		70.47	19.27	-7.99		65.52	36.30	
% of total 2005		32.32	22.03	5.97		22.35	17.33	
% of total 2009		36.07	17.20	3.60		24.22	15.47	

Source: Dansk Universiteter

TABLE 5: ANALYSIS OF ALL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURE, DANISH UNIVERSITIES 2005-9 (Thousand Kroner)					
	Research administration	Teaching administration	Central administration	Buildings/estates administration	Total administration costs
2005	577732	770421	989210	914881	3252244
2009	963153	1272893	1870997	1276220	5383263
Increase	385421	502472	881787	361339	2131019
	66.71	65.22	89.14	39.50	65.52
% total expenditure in 2005	4.0	5.3	6.8	6.3	22.35
% total expenditure in 2009	4.33	5.73	8.42	5.74	24.22
% Increase (decrease) in total expenditure 2005-9	0.36	0.43	1.62	-0.54	1.87
Additional funds used (not used) for administration as consequence increased proportion	80003	95559	360012	(120004)	415569

Source: Dansk Universiteter

Table 6: COPENHAGEN UNIVERSITY, ANALYSIS OF ALL EXPENDITURE (thousands of Kroner)								
		Research	Teaching	Dissemination	Research institute work	All administration	Buildings	Total
KU	2005	1124317	710220	255686		952825	869396	3912444
DFU		100360	53976	5977		49692	46533	256538
KVL		502281	214575	147162		146076	165386	1175480
Total 2005		1726958	978771	408825		1148593	1081315	5344462
	2009	2473510	1069487	273559	211984	1724818	1394394	7147752
Increase		746552	90716	-135266		576225	313079	1803290
% change		43.23	9.27	-33.09		50.17	28.95	33.74
% of total 2005		32.31	18.31	7.65		21.49	20.23	
% of total 2009		34.61	14.96	3.83		24.13	19.51	

Source: Dansk Universiteter

Table 7: AARHUS UNIVERSITY, ANALYSIS OF ALL EXPENDITURE (thousands of Kroner)								
		Research	Teaching	Dissemination	Research institute work	All administration	Buildings	Total
AU	2005	938648	561470	94940		450384	368100	2413542
ASB	2005	73263	119163	16922		95610	13389	318347
DPU	2005	127616	41232	28182		53998	27475	278503
Total 2005		1139527	721865	140044		599992	408964	3010392
	2009	2006197	963770	165323	305226	1120309	715035	5275860
Increase		866670	241905	25279		520317	306071	2265468
% change		76.06	33.51	18.05		86.72	74.84	75.25
% of total 2005		37.85	23.98	4.65		19.93	13.59	
% of total 2009		38.03	18.27	3.13		21.23	13.55	

Source: Dansk Universiteter

Table 8: UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN DENMARK, ANALYSIS OF ALL EXPENDITURE (thousands of Kroner)								
		Research	Teaching	Dissemination	Research institute work	All administration	Buildings	Total
	2005	406046	324400	124203		390990	251402	1497041
	2009	676861	500877	75981	27975	692445	285696	2259835
Increase		270815	176477	-48222		301455	34294	762794
% change		66.70	54.40	-38.83		77.10	13.64	50.95
% of total 2005		27.12	21.67	8.30		26.12	16.79	
% of total 2009		29.95	22.16	3.36		30.64	12.64	

Source: Dansk Universiteter

Table 9: ROSKILDE UNIVERSITY, ANALYSIS OF ALL EXPENDITURE (thousands of Kroner)								
		Research	Teaching	Dissemination	Research institute work	All administration	Buildings	Total
	2005	175188	162335	28052		117650	89501	572726
	2009	219440	190118	30400	0	145552	99628	685138
Increase		44252	27783	2348	0	27902	10127	112412
% change		25.26	17.11	8.37		23.72	11.31	19.63
% of total 2005		30.59	28.34	4.90		20.54	15.63	
% of total 2009		32.03	27.75	4.44		21.24	14.54	

Source: Dansk Universiteter

Table 10: AALBORG UNIVERSITY, ANALYSIS OF ALL EXPENDITURE (thousands of Kroner)								
		Research	Teaching	Dissemination	Research institute work	All administration	Buildings	Total
	2005	458138	385422	75350		302154	212785	1433849
	2009	605979	378398	91010	34100	416937	263202	1789626
Increase		147841	-7024	15660	34100	114783	50417	355777
% change		32.27	-1.82	20.78		37.99	23.69	24.81
% of total 2005		31.95	26.88	5.26		21.07	14.84	
% of total 2009		33.86	21.14	5.09		23.30	14.71	

Source: Dansk Universiteter

Table 11: DANISH TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, ANALYSIS OF ALL EXPENDITURE (thousands of Kroner)								
		Research	Teaching	Dissemination	Research institute work	All administration	Buildings	Total
	2005	600863	288750	57456		439997	326401	1713467
	2009	1742746	363504	123051	183904	869830	496256	3779291
Increase		1141883	74754	65595	183904	429833	169855	2065824
% change		190.04	25.89	114.17		97.69	52.04	120.56
% of total 2005		35.07	16.85	3.35		25.68	19.05	
% of total 2009		46.11	9.62	3.26		23.02	13.13	

Source: Dansk Universiteter

Table 12: COPENHAGEN BUSINESS SCHOOL, ANALYSIS OF ALL EXPENDITURE (thousands of Kroner)								
		Research	Teaching	Dissemination	Research institute work	All administration	Buildings	Total
	2005	159344	320181	33130		210817	121152	844624
	2009	248868	320687	39348		335382	147520	1091805
Increase		89524	506	6218		124565	26368	247181
% change		56.18	0.16	18.77		59.09	21.76	29.27
% of total 2005		18.87	37.91	3.92		24.96	14.34	
% of total 2009		22.79	29.37	3.60		30.72	13.51	

Source: Dansk Universiteter

Table 13: IT UNIVERSITY, ANALYSIS OF ALL EXPENDITURE (thousands of Kroner)								
		Research	Teaching	Dissemination	Research institute work	All administration	Buildings	Total
	2005	36415	23840	2200		42051	30306	134812
	2009	42659	36380	1131	0	77990	35466	193626
Increase		6244	12540	-1069		35939	5160	58814
% change		17.15	52.60	-48.59		85.47	17.03	43.63
% of total 2005		27.01	17.68	1.63		31.19	22.48	
% of total2009		22.03	18.79	0.58		40.28	18.32	

Source: Dansk Universiteter

TABLE 14: SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS, DANISH UNIVERSITIES 2005-9					
University	All administration as % of total expenditure in 2005	All administration as % of total expenditure in 2009	% Change in share of total expenditure	Resulting increase/(decrease) in expenditure in 2009 in 000s Kroner	(Cost)/savings expressed as lektor posts
KU	21.49	24.13	2.64	188701	(339)
AU	19.93	21.23	1.3	68586	(123)
SDU	26.12	30.64	4.52	102144	(183)
RUC	20.54	21.24	.07	47960	(86)
AAU	21.07	23.30	2.23	39909	(72)
DTU	25.68	23.02	(2.66)	(100529)	180
CBS	24.96	30.72	5.76	62888	(113)
ITU	31.19	40.28	9.09	17600	(32)

Source: Dansk Universiteter

TABLE 15: STAFFING CHANGES IN DANISH UNIVERSITIES 2005-9									
	TAPs: Central administration	Total TAPs		Full Time VIPS	Part Time VIPS	Total VIPS	Total all staff	Percent TAP of total staff	TAPS: FT VIPS
KU 2005	527	3878		3156	429	3585	7463	51.96	1.2
2009	674	4195		4012	394	4406	8601	48.77	1.0
% change	28	8		27	-8	23	15		
AU 2005	344	2107		2212	316	2528	4635	45.46	1.0
2009	558	3240		3212	423	3635	6875	47.13	1.0
% change	62	54		45	34	44	48		
SDU 2005	192	942		1034	168	1202	2144	43.94	0.9
2009	279	1338		1503	219	1722	3060	43.73	0.9
% change	45	42		45	30	43	43		
RUC 2005	309	333		424	100	524	857	38.86	0.8
2009	37	347		474	98	572	919	37.76	0.7
% change	-88	4		12	-2	9	7		

Source: Financial reports and accounts

TABLE 15 (CONTINUED): STAFFING CHANGES IN DANISH UNIVERSITIES 2005-9										
		TAPs: Central administration	Total TAPs		Full Time VIPS	Part Time VIPS	Total VIPS	Total all staff	Percent TAP of total staff	TAPS: FT VIPS
AAU	2005	229	849		1188	104	1292	2141	39.65	0.7
	2009	205	1011		1291	92	1383	2394	42.23	0.8
	% change	-10	19		9	-12	7	12		
DTU	2005	120	889		1361	57	1418	2307	38.53	0.7
	2009	403	2173		2382	41	2423	4596	47.28	0.9
	% change	236	144		75	-28	71	99		
CBS	2005	79	540		489	215	704	1244	43.41	1.1
	2009	117	675		508	196	704	1379	48.95	1.3
	% change	48	25		4	-9	0	11		
ITU	2005	29	74		78	14	92	166	44.58	0.9
	2009	51	110		84	20	104	214		1.3
	% change	76	49		8	43	13	29		
	Total 2005	1829	9612		9942	1403	11345	20957	45.87	1.0
	Total 2009	2324	13089		13466	1483	14949	28038	46.68	1.0
	% change	27.06	36.17		35.45	5.7	31.77	33.79		

Source: Financial reports and accounts

TABLE 16: COSTS PER TAP, DANISH UNIVERSITIES 2005-9					
	Year	Number of TAPs	Administration costs	000s Kroner per TAP	% increase (decrease) 2005-9
KU	2005	3878	1148593	296	
	2009	4195	1724818	411	38.8
AU	2005	2107	599992	285	
	2009	3240	1120309	346	21
SDU	2005	942	390990	415	
	2009	1338	692445	518	25
RUC	2005	333	117650	353	
	2009	347	145552	419	19
AAU	2005	849	302154	356	
	2009	1011	416937	412	16
DTU	2005	889	439997	495	
	2009	2173	869830	400	(19)
CBS	2005	540	210817	390	
	2009	675	335382	497	27
ITU	2005	74	42051	568	
	2009	110	77990	709	25
Totals	2005	9612	3252244	395	
	2009	13089	5383263	464	18

Source: Dansk Universiteter

Table 17: NET WORTH AND LIQUIDITY, DANISH UNIVERSITIES 2005-9 (thousands of Kroner)						
				2009	2005	% increase
Copenhagen	Current assets			2530667	1602396	
	Fixed assets			967203	464391	
	Long-term liabilities			189600	106168	
	Current liabilities			2578286	1624161	
	Net worth			729984	336458	217.0
	Liquidity			0.98	0.99	
Aarhus	Current assets			2161538	1084791	
	Fixed assets			865859	644071	
	Long-term liabilities			35828	190597	
	Current liabilities			2235841	1319583	
	Net worth			755728	218682	345.6
	Liquidity			0.97	0.82	
Southern Denmark	Current assets			989549	642423	
	Fixed assets			509079	299241	
	Long-term liabilities			191249	138579	
	Current liabilities			866940	548830	
	Net worth			440439	254255	173.2
	Liquidity			1.14	1.17	
Roskilde	Current assets			289911	137587	
	Fixed assets			44321	16529	
	Long-term liabilities			8084	8906	
	Current liabilities			258483	157833	
	Net worth			67665	-12623	
Liquidity			1.12	0.87		

Table 17 (CONTINUED): NET WORTH AND LIQUIDITY, DANISH UNIVERSITIES 2005-9 (thousands of Kroner)						
				2009	2005	
Aalborg University	Current assets			683706	414043	
	Fixed assets			223383	147264	
	Long-term liabilities			30721	24390	
	Current liabilities			565767	469464	
	Net worth			310601	67453	460.5
	Liquidity			1.21	0.88	
Danish Technical University	Current assets			1400546	686027	
	Fixed assets			4340761	4010896	
	Long-term liabilities			1946948	1859886	
	Current liabilities			1542733	672860	
	Net worth			2251626	2164177	104.0
	Liquidity			0.91	1.02	
Copenhagen Business School	Current assets			210605	235968	
	Fixed assets			1187853	1002301	
	Long-term liabilities			900998	835919	
	Current liabilities			313179	375149	
	Net worth			184281	27201	677.5
	Liquidity			0.67	0.63	
IT University of Copenhagen	Current assets			106149	55851	
	Fixed assets			5584	7968	
	Long-term liabilities					
	Current liabilities			57609	40532	
	Net worth			54124	23287	232.4
	Liquidity			1.84	1.38	

Source: Financial reports and accounts

Working Papers in the University Reform Series:

1. Setting Universities Free? The background to the self-ownership of Danish Universities, Jakob Williams Ørberg, July 2006.
2. Trust in Universities - Parliamentary debates on the 2003 university law, Jakob Williams Ørberg, October 2006.
3. Histories of RUC - Roskilde University Centre, Else Hansen, November 2006.
4. An Insight into the Ideas Surrounding the 2003 University Law - Development contracts and management reforms, Peter Brink Andersen, November 2006.
5. Who Speaks for the University? - Legislative frameworks for Danish university leadership 1970-2003, Jakob Williams Ørberg, May 2007
6. 'After Neoliberalism'? - The reform of New Zealand's university system, Cris Shore, June 2007
7. Women in Academia - Women's career paths in the social sciences, in the context of Lund University and Swedish higher education, Susan Wright, October 2007
8. Will market-based ventures substitute for government funding? - Theorising university financial management, Penny Ciancanelli, May 2008
9. Measurements and Distortions – A Review of the British System of Research Assessment, Susan Wright, May 2008
10. Becoming and Being: University reform, biography and the everyday practice of sociologists, Nicola Spurling, June 2009
11. Polishing the Family Silver. Discussions at Roskilde University Center in Advance of the 2003 University Law, Nathalia Brichet, August 2009
12. Forandringsprocesser i akademien. En empirisk undersøgelse af medarbejderperspektiver på en fusionsproces i anledning af universitetsfusionerne, Gertrud Lynges Esbensen, September 2009
13. Recent Higher Education Reforms in Vietnam: The Role of the World Bank, Que Ahn Dang, October 2009
14. The organization of the university, Hans Siggaard Jensen, April 2010
15. Collegialism, Democracy and University Governance – The Case of Denmark, Hans Siggaard Jensen, June 2010