HOW ADEQUATELY DO STATES ACKNOWLEDGE THE BROAD ACCESS INSTITUTION MISSION?
A CONTENT AND DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF STATE FUNDING MODELS

July 2025

CECILIA M. ORPHAN
KATIE KLEINHESSELINK
ESSA NJIE

How Adequately do States Acknowledge the Broad Access Institution Mission?
A Content and Discourse Analysis of State Funding Models

Policymakers commonly assert that Broad Access Institutions (BAIs) cannot be "all things to all people" when cutting their funding (Ellis, 2019). Yet BAIs were founded with comprehensive missions to foster postsecondary access and student-centeredness for diverse students who were excluded from non-BAIs, and to promote regional workforce and community development (Crisp et al., 2019; Orphan, 2018; Supplee et al., 2023). Following Crisp and colleagues (2019), we define BAIs as four-year public institutions that accept at least 80% of applicants. BAIs generate postsecondary access through low barriers for admission and affordable tuition and promote student-centeredness through institutional foci on students, learning, and teaching (Orphan & McClure, 2022). Being student-centered and accessible and addressing regional needs may necessitate being "all things" to students and communities (Orphan & McClure 2019; Supplee et al., 2023). Yet, policy rhetoric of "not being all things to all people" may reveal a lack of understanding of, or appreciation for, the comprehensive BAI mission, which may in turn influence policymakers' choices about how to fund higher education.

The current study evaluated how adequately funding models across states in the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) region account for the student-centeredness, regional service, and postsecondary access missions of BAIs. We built on Layzell (2007), who posited that funding adequacy ensures that postsecondary institutions have enough funding to fulfill their missions, to conceptualize adequacy as existing when state funding models explicitly acknowledged and resourced BAIs. We do not consider funding levels and amounts for BAIs specifically, but instead examine how state funding models acknowledge the BAI mission as one that is distinct from other institutional missions (e.g., that of community colleges, private universities, flagship universities, etc.) worthy of state investment. We achieved this goal by scoring states on measures that reveal how adequately they account for the BAI mission.

We were interested in BAIs given their vital role in generating upward mobility and educational equity for low-income students and racially minoritized students (de Alva 2019) and their regional service (Orphan et al., 2018; Orphan et al., 2022). We were interested in the WICHE states because they make up a large and diverse swath of the United States, ranging from the most populous and racially diverse state (California) to some of the least populous and racially diverse states (Montana and Wyoming).

We conceptualize state funding models as policy texts that act as scholars *in situ*, discursively constructing the purpose of BAIs and their role in their states, and by extension, the marginalized students they enroll. Prior research demonstrates that BAIs and their students receive inequitable funding relative to non-BAIs, including land grant and flagship institutions (Horn et al., 2023; Orphan et al., 2022), yet state funding levels are correlated with outcomes for marginalized students, with higher funding leading to better student outcomes (Ahlman et al., 2019; Cummings et al., 2021; Horn et al., 2023). Research has also found that BAIs that serve students with the highest needs receive the least amount of state funding (Ahlman et al., 2019). Our research explored how state funding models facilitate or stunt student success *vis-à-vis* acknowledgement of this institutional mission.

Our study used critical emancipatory policy theory, which explores the benefits and harms created by policy and funding for marginalized communities such as racially minoritized students and low-income

BAI students (Felix & Nienhusser, 2023) to examine and score state funding models. We used Policy Discourse Analysis (PDA) and content analysis to examine state funding models (Allan & Tolbert, 2019; Drisko & Maschi, 2015). We answered three research questions: 1) How do state funding models account for the comprehensive BAI mission? 2) How do state funding models maintain differentiated postsecondary systems with unique institutional types such as BAIs? 3) How are the missions of BAIs discursively constructed in state funding models? The first two questions examined how state funding models position BAIs to enact their comprehensive missions and differentiate BAIs from other institutional types. The last question explored how state funding models produce BAIs by constructing their missions in particular ways that may harm or benefit students.

Our study significantly showed how the potential and academic experiences of BAI students are structured by state funding, with states inadequately acknowledging their missions. The upward mobility, affordability, and regional wellbeing BAIs generate is striking given the funding disparities they face. Yet prior research demonstrates that being affordable and efficient comes at a cost, as BAIs have fewer tenured faculty and full-time instructors and staff to serve students, which negatively affects student outcomes (Ahlman et al., 2019), and many BAIs have curtailed community development initiatives to address funding cuts (Orphan, 2018; Orphan et al., 2022). Our study further exposed how state funding models may be narrowing the comprehensive mission of BAIs to their postsecondary and workforce development roles, which carries implications for the students and communities they serve. We argue that these policy choices harden funding hierarchies in states that harm BAIs and their students. Our major conceptual contribution was to expand the notion of funding adequacy beyond funding levels to consider how states adequately account for the comprehensive BAI mission (Ward et al., 2020).

Literature Review

We contextualized our study using research exploring BAIs, state funding models and notions of funding adequacy, and mission differentiation in higher education. We discuss each body of literature in turn.

Broad Access Institutions

Research demonstrates that BAIs serve important roles in their communities and in fostering educational equity. BAIs educate half of bachelor's degree-seeking students and large numbers of low-income, first-generation, veteran, rural, English language learner, immigrant, and racially minoritized students (Orphan & McClure, 2022; Wellman, 2011). FAFSA data show that 30% of BAI students have an expected family contribution of $0, which reveals their financial needs and the importance of state funding to support their success (Turk, 2021). BAIs also graduate a large share of the nation's frontline and essential workforce including K-12 teachers, public health professionals, and public safety officers (Orphan, 2018; Orphan & McClure, 2022). The regions BAIs serve are more likely to experience persistent poverty and be medically underserved, a reality underscoring the important regional contributions BAIs make through the degrees they award (Orphan et al., 2022).

Traditional measures of institutional quality typically found in state funding models fail to capture BAIs' value to students and regions. For example, institutional retention and graduation rates are generally calculated using full-time, first-time student cohorts, which fail to account for transfer, part-time, and returning adult learners who are disproportionately represented at BAIs (Crisp et al., 2021; Orphan et al., 2022). Despite this, research shows that due to their student-centeredness, BAIs provide comparable

faculty and student interactions to those of non-BAIs (Baker et al., 2017). On balance, research demonstrates that BAIs center equity, generate upward mobility, and contribute to regional and national wellbeing, despite facing funding challenges.

State Funding Models and Notions of Funding Adequacy

States employ diverse funding models, which influence institutional and student success (Kelchen & Horn, 2022). Some funding models rely on historical allocations to make future allocations, others use complex formulae intended to incentivize institutional performance. Still other models tie funding to enrollment, yet differ in how they apportion per student funding, either by headcount or full-time enrollment (FTE). State models also vary in how they account for expenditures on instruction, research, auxiliaries, and public service (Dziesinski & Hillman, 2024). These differences raise questions about funding adequacy for higher education.

The idea of funding adequacy originated in research about, and law governing, K-12 funding and has only recently been applied to higher education, with scholars advancing various definitions for postsecondary funding adequacy (Ward et al., 2020). For example, some scholars advance institutionally focused definitions, such as Layzell (2007), who defined funding adequacy as existing when state funding models effectively position each institution to fulfill their missions. Ward and colleagues (2020) advanced a more student-centered definition, asserting that adequacy exists when funding levels enable institutions to generate positive educational outcomes, funding is equitably distributed so that all students are supported, and outcomes-based funding creates incentives for fostering student success. Richmond and colleagues (2024) define adequacy in both institutional and student terms, arguing that it exists when states adequately fund institutions serving students with the highest needs. Dziesinski and Hillman (2024) defined adequacy as providing resources to reach specified educational outcomes, particularly given research demonstrating that institutional resources are correlated with student success (Hillman et al., 2024; Kelchen et al., 2023).

Scholars have made several recommendations for ensuring postsecondary funding adequacy. Ward and colleagues (2020) recommended that thresholds clearly delineate what adequate funding entails, funding models be differentiated to account for differences in institutional mission, and states use performance indicators to identify areas of growth for institutions rather than ways to decrease funding. Richmond and colleagues (2024) advocated for student-based funding models that weight funding based on unique student needs as well as institutional location and size, given the funding disparities rural and small institutions face (Koricich et al., 2022). While research has explored what levels of funding would adequately position institutions for student success (e.g., Ward et al., 2020), there has been less attention to how the concept of adequacy might be used to understand how state funding models acknowledge differences in institutional mission.

Mission Differentiation

To understand how funding models might adequately acknowledge differences in institutional missions, we turned to the literature on mission differentiation in higher education. David Longanecker (2008) defined mission differentiation as "an array of types of institutions, each with a clearly designated mission, and a clear expectation that institutions would seek excellence but would do so within their designated mission" (p. 1). Mission differentiation originally derived from status hierarchies extant in the U.S. postsecondary system that intensified as BAIs were established to promote postsecondary

access and public research universities were legitimized in claiming greater public resources (Clark, 1987). Later, state policymakers reinforced mission differentiation using academic program approval processes, funding models, and statutorily mandated service areas for institutions (Kumar, 2022). As a result of the hierarchical nature of differentiation, states commonly allocate fewer resources to BAIs than non-BAIs, the rationale being that BAIs need fewer resources to enact their missions when in fact BAIs students have greater needs, and the more resources an institution has, the greater student outcomes it can generate (Taylor & Cantwell 2019). The hierarchical nature of institutional differentiation captured in policy and funding promotes a discourse that BAIs, their faculty, and students are less scholarly than non-BAIs and warrant less funding (Kumar, 2022).

By contrast, mission differentiation paired with adequate funding across institution types can strengthen state economies and communities when institutions are charged with addressing specific industry, educational, student, and public needs (Longanecker, 2008). This positive attribute of differentiation is particularly relevant for BAIs, which often distinguish themselves by serving specific students (e.g., Minority-Serving Institutions) or regions (e.g., Rural-Serving Institutions) (Koricich et al., 2022; Orphan et al., 2022). As Longanecker (2008) asserted, then, mission differentiation is as much a financial question as it is an organizational one, and research shows that states with the best student outcomes are those that ensure that BAIs are adequately resourced (Hillman et al., 2024; Kelchen et al., 2023).

In sum, research demonstrates that BAIs promote educational equity, state funding levels shape how well these institutions can serve students and communities, and mission differentiation paired with adequate funding correlate with organizational and student success (de Alva, 2019; Hillman et al., 2024; Kelchen et al., 2023; Orphan et al., 2022). Prior research has considered funding level adequacy (e.g., Ward et al., 2020) but has not examined how adequately postsecondary funding models differentiate institutional missions. This study addresses these knowledge needs by exploring how state funding models acknowledge differences in institutional mission and discursively construct the BAI mission.

Theoretical Framework

This study used a critical emancipatory theoretical framework to examine state funding models (Felix & Nienhusser, 2023), which conceptualizes policy implementation as an act of power that allocates harm or benefits to people depending on their social status (Felix & Nienhusser, 2023). Policymaker decisions about how to structure and disperse funding are a vital step in the policy implementation process, which reveal the position of postsecondary institutions in state systems (Taylor & Cantwell, 2019). We used this framework to explore how BAIs are resourced and discursively constructed by state funding models, as well as how states encourage mission differentiation. State policymakers are not solely responsible for discursively constructing institutional missions. Institutional leaders have agency to construct their missions and respond to policymaker mandates (Orphan, 2018). That said, policymakers have influence over how institutional missions evolve and are enacted through the oversight and funding they provide (Taylor & Cantwell, 2019). This dynamic can, in part, be explained by resource dependence theory, which argues that organizations come to resemble and adopt the priorities and characteristics of their funding sources (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). In higher education, institutions may adopt the priorities of policymakers to secure funding and legitimacy within state systems (Bennett & Law, 2021). We acknowledge these power dynamics and use Layzell's (2007) definition of funding adequacy to consider how states position BAIs to fulfill their missions through the design of state funding models and discursive construction of institutional missions.

By using critical emancipatory theory, we answer one of the major questions critical policy analyses pose, namely, "what does policy do" to BAIs and their students (Felix & Nienhusser, 2023)? We theorized that state funding models are sites of social reproduction, with non-BAI students often receiving greater resources, *vis-à-vis* their institutional affiliations, than BAI students. We also explored how state funding models, and their acknowledgement (or lack thereof) of the BAI mission, shape states' abilities to generate equitable outcomes for all students and communities.

Critical emancipatory theory (Felix & Nienhusser, 2023) is practice-oriented and calls on scholars to expose and redistribute policy power and benefits to those who are marginalized. We exposed state power to adequately acknowledge the BAI mission by scoring state performance in this area. We also conducted a PDA of state funding models, which is a power-focused methodology intended to explore power in policy texts (Allan & Tolbert, 2019). Ultimately, our concern was with BAI students and regions, and how state funding models structure their experiences and opportunities. By using this framework, we generate possibilities for equity-focused state funding models that adequately acknowledge the BAI mission and support the students and regions they serve.

Research Methods

We used content analysis to understand how funding models maintain differentiated postsecondary systems that acknowledge BAIs as a unique institutional type (Drisko & Maschi, 2015). We used policy discourse analysis to understand how state funding models discursively constructed and produced the BAI mission, while distributing harms and benefits BAI students and regions (Allan & Tolbert, 2019). Policy discourse analysis is "grounded in emancipatory principles" (Allan & Tolbert, 2019, p. 145), making it a fitting analytical approach for our theoretical framework.

Data Collection

Our first data collection step was to gather data from the WICHE states that have BAIs. The WICHE states are Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawai'i, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. We used the Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS; 2022) to determine the admissions rates of four-year public universities in each state and found that all WICHE states, besides Alaska, had BAIs that admitted at least 80% of students (Crisp et al., 2021); we collected data from the remaining 14 states. There are 195 public four-year institutions across these states, 166 of which are BAIs (or 84% of institutions) (IPEDS, 2022). States ranged in the proportion of BAIs in their postsecondary systems. In five states (Montana, Nevada, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming), all four-year public institutions were BAIs. North Dakota had the smallest proportion of BAIs (56% of four-year public institutions). In addition to four-year public institutions and BAIs, all states had community and technical colleges within their public postsecondary systems.

We collected policy and legal documents to answer our research questions. Some states have specific laws and statutes that govern their funding models, whereas others deploy both policies and laws (Hillman et al., 2024; Kelchen et al., 2024). We collected legal documents, including legislation dictating the design and implementation of performance-based funding, budget request processes, and state appropriations (see Appendix A for a sample list of laws we analyzed). We also collected policy documents, including analyses of funding models, postsecondary appropriations, performance funding, budget request processes, budget presentations, and policymaker statements about postsecondary

funding. We collected the most recently available budget requests and proposals made by state higher education executive officers (SHEEOs), institutions, and governors, and compared these documents to final state budgets. We collected state policy documents by visiting each state's governor's higher education and SHEEO agency websites, which we identified using the State Higher Education Executive Officers Association (SHEEO) website (n.d.). We collected legal documents from LexisNexis. We used the following search terms with each state's name to identify relevant laws: "performance-based funding," "outcomes-based funding," "higher education appropriations," "higher education funding," "budget requests," "education funding," and "general appropriations." Some states had laws requiring the use of performance funding but did not specify the metrics or formulae. In these cases, we collected state policy documents identifying performance funding metrics and formulae. Most often, these documents were available on SHEEO websites or House or Senate education or budget committee websites, depending on which entity had jurisdiction over performance funding. At times, we were unable to locate publicly available documents, in which case we contacted SHEEO offices and requested information.

Prior research demonstrates that transparency in postsecondary funding supports BAIs in enacting their missions (Orphan & Laderman, 2024), and we conceptualized funding transparency as an exercise of power that shapes how BAI leaders respond to funding models. As such, we collected documents that guided the transparency of the state's budget process, including relevant laws requiring that budgets be transparent and any public-facing webpages or data dashboards explaining each state's postsecondary funding model. Because some states fund higher education via student financial aid, we collected data about state financial aid programs. Our final dataset included 189 documents.

Data Analysis

Data analysis included two phases. We conducted a content analysis using inductive and emergent coding to make inferences about state funding models (Drisko & Maschi, 2015). We explored the actual content of state funding models, including how different sectors are funded and defined, with special attention to how BAI missions are acknowledged. We met as a research team to identify a list of inductive codes that aligned with our theoretical framework and analysis of prior research. Then, each team member coded data for one state (Maine) and compared coding approaches to ensure inter-rater reliability. During this initial coding experience, we identified emergent codes. Next, we divided the states among the three researchers and coded them. *Table 1* includes a list of codes and examples of text assigned to those codes. Through content analysis, we answered our first and second research questions.

Next, we used PDA to answer our third research question regarding the discursive construction of the BAI mission (Allan & Tolbert, 2019). First, we performed a comprehensive analysis and close reading of each state's policy texts, answering the following questions through memoing, self-reflexive analysis, and team discussion: How are BAIs resourced in state funding models? How do state funding models account for the educational equity mission of BAIs? What harms or benefits are created by state funding models? How are the missions of BAIs constructed? How transparent are the funding models? We reviewed and re-interpreted our findings from the content analysis using these questions to perform an emancipatory analysis and understand the flows of power, harms, and benefits for BAIs and their students and regions (Felix & Nienhusser, 2023). We then identified themes regarding how states discursively constructed the BAI mission, attending to what was explicitly stated as well as the policy silences present. Finally, we identified the dominant discourse operating in each state about BAIs and their placement within state funding models.

Development of Scorecard Metrics

We decided to score states along a set of metrics to systematically assess how they were acknowledging the BAI mission. Our final scoring rubric had 15 possible points (see *Table 2*). We acknowledge that developing a scorecard of this nature is a subjective process; however, we identified points to assign metrics, and which metrics to use, after careful discussion, review of prior literature, and consideration of our theoretical framework, research questions, and findings from our content analysis and PDA. Our overarching goal was to identify metrics that would demonstrate a state's adequate acknowledgement of the BAI mission. In this context, if a state were to score perfectly across these mission metrics, that would indicate adequate acknowledgement of the BAI mission.

The final rubric contained categories that align with the BAI mission and the literature on mission differentiation (Crisp et al., 2019; Longanecker, 2008). We created a category with two sub-metrics focused on mission differentiation, which considered if state budget models explicitly mentioned the BAI mission (2 points), and if there was evidence of differentiation based on institutional mission (2 points). We allocated six points to assess how states adequately accounted for the comprehensive BAI mission to foster regional wellbeing, student-centeredness, and postsecondary access.

We evaluated student-centeredness based on if funding models used time-based completion metrics, such as six-year graduation rates (if they did, we assert that states were failing to acknowledge BAI service to part-time students who take longer to graduate) (.5 point); if states included retention metrics, which would encourage student-centeredness (.5 pint); and if states encouraged advising, tutoring, and holistic supports (1 point). We evaluated regional service by whether states included funding for institutions to engage in community development and public service (1 point) and economic and workforce development (1 point).

To assess postsecondary access, we considered if states encouraged institutions to have low admissions barriers (.5 point) and enroll state residents (.5 point). We also explored how states ensured affordability, an important component of access, and awarded states if they provided tuition freeze incentives and had state aid programs that acknowledged students' financial need and race (.5 point each). Our final BAI mission metric considered whether states incentivized institutions to foster equity across the three BAI mission domains (1 point). We also awarded states one point if they provided equal per-student funding across their public institutions. We allocated one point to states that had publicly available websites or data dashboards explaining the state's higher education funding model.

Credibility and Validity

The rigor of content analyses is determined by steps researchers take to ensure validity (Drisko & Maschi, 2015); in PDA, credibility creates rigor (Allan & Tolbert 2019). To establish validity in the content analysis, we included multiple data sources, including budgets, legislation, and policy documents, to triangulate our analysis and test interpretations (Drisko & Maschi, 2015). To ensure inter-coder reliability, we met regularly to verify data collection and analysis approaches and interpretations. Finally, we invited an expert with knowledge of state funding models (a SHEEO staff member) to review our analysis and scorecard metrics. To ensure the credibility of our PDA, we clearly "articulated stages of document sampling and data analyses" (Allan & Tolbert, 2019, p. 144) through an audit trail. We also engaged in reflexivity, regularly examining our assumptions and predictions about analysis through memoing and team conversation.

Limitations and Delimitations

Our only limitation was that we were unable to locate sufficient data about Washington's funding model. We emailed their state's senior postsecondary policymaker and he shared that the state had not implemented aspects of its funding model. We analyzed the policy texts we could find, but additional analyses of Washington following full implementation of their funding model are invited.

We intentionally delimited our analysis to WICHE states with BAIs to create a comparison group that have documented inter-state relationships and policy diffusion networks (WICHE, n.d.). We excluded Alaska from our analysis because the state has no BAIs. Because no state funding model fully funded a single BAI in our study, institutional leaders have choices about how to use institutional resources to advance their own missions (Orphan & Laderman, 2024). Our focus was on the state funding models themselves and how they incentivized and acknowledged the BAI mission, and we did not consider how institutions used other funds to advance this mission.

Findings

Our overarching finding was that states do not adequately account for the BAI mission in their funding models. *Table 3* includes each state's scores. The mean score was 9.79 out of 15 possible points. On the "explicit mention of the BAI mission" metric, eight states scored two points. We awarded Utah and Washington one point each for partial mention of the BAI mission. For the "differentiated state funding model" metric, 10 states earned two points, while Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington earned zero, with little differentiation in their funding models. In Arizona, for example, the state's Land Fund is differentiated by normal school/research university type, while the state funding model in California is differentiated by mission type and maps onto the state's Master Plan for higher education, which designates three public institutional types: community and technical colleges, BAIs, and exclusionary research universities. In Colorado, the funding model differentiation is primarily based on four-year and two-year institutions, with some set aside for special focus institutions, such as Colorado School of Mines; however, there was no acknowledgement of the BAI mission. In Montana, the model emphasizes mission differentiation between flagship universities, regional universities (many of which are BAIs), and two-year colleges. In Nevada, all four-year institutions are BAIs, and differentiation is based on two-year versus four-year status rather than institutional mission.

In the BAI Comprehensive Mission/"student-centeredness" category, all but four states had "no time-based completion metrics," nine states scored .5 for "retention," all but three states provided "incentives/funding for students support services," and eight states provided "incentives/funding for holistic student needs." In the "Postsecondary Access" domain, two states (Arizona and North Dakota) scored a "0" on the "incentivizes low admissions barriers" and "enrolling state residents" metrics, and Hawai'i emphasized enrolling state residents but not low admissions barriers. Just five states incentivized tuition freezes, and all but two states (South Dakota and Wyoming) provided financial aid to marginalized students at the time of data collection, although this may have changed since the Trump Administration took over in January 2025. Regarding the "regional service/wellbeing" metrics, all states promoted economic/workforce development, but three states scored a zero for the "community development/public service" metric (Colorado, North Dakota, and Utah). Half of the states received one point for incentivizing BAIs to foster equity across the three mission domains. In California, the funding model considers the number of low-income students a college enrolls. In Oregon, the funding model seeks to improve degree outcomes and equity for Oregonians. In Washington, there is a Student

Achievement Council Strategic Plan, which highlights the educational equity missions of BAIs, including marginalized students.

New Mexico scored the highest among all the states, with 13.5 points (four points above the average). The state scored a maximum of four points in the mission differentiation metric, with a formula-driven model that depends on completion metrics and mission-specific goals. The state also scored seven points in meeting the comprehensive mission of BAIs, with funding for public service projects. The state also offers tuition-free programs for New Mexicans and aid for marginalized students, with a view to enhancing postsecondary access and fostering equity across the BAI mission domains. However, the absence of tuition freeze incentives and equal funding across all four-year public institutions affected the state's overall score. North Dakota scored the lowest. The funding model's failure to promote institutional mission differentiation or acknowledge the BAI mission contributed to this score.

All states, except Hawai'i, scored one point for "transparency," with the existence of legislation, policy guidance, or dashboards intended to promote funding transparency. Except for Wyoming, which has only one four-year public university (the University of Wyoming), all states scored zero on the equal funding per-student funding metric.

Policy Discourse Analysis

The WICHE states' funding models reflect diverse assumptions about the roles BAIs do and should play in fomenting social equity and states' broader community and economic vitality. Across the states' funding models, BAIs are positioned as engines of workforce development, couching students' education in terms of their ability to contribute to state economies. Some models exhibit an explicit facial equity focus, in terms of enrolling and graduating racially minoritized students. However, our PDA revealed that funding models often failed to account for the full scope of the BAI mission, thus hierarchizing institutions based on narrow interpretations of mission and underfunding BAIs. In the sections that follow, we describe how state funding models discursively construct the BAI mission while maintaining institutional hierarchies.

Discursive Constructions of the BAI Mission

BAIs have comprehensive missions to foster postsecondary access, student-centeredness, and regional service (Crisp et al., 2019; Orphan, 2018). However, funding models in many WICHE states narrowly construct the BAI mission in strictly workforce and economic development terms. For instance, most state models incentivize institutions to produce graduates in what Oregon's Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) (n.d.) describes as "high-demand and high-reward fields" (p. 3), aligning educational programs with in-state industries that offer well-paying jobs, such as STEM and health care. In this way, states aim to bolster their economies and individual resident's wealth, thereby couching students as what Foucault (1979) termed *homo economicus*, or "entrepreneurs of the self" (p. 225), whose intrinsic value is tied to their economic contributions regardless of racial identity, gender, or income status, or other aspirations they might hold. In a budget presentation to the New Mexico Senate Finance Committee, Cabinet Secretary Stephanie Rodriguez offered the following rationale for New Mexico's Opportunity Grant program, which provides financial aid to low-income students:

> "Many jobs in today's economy require an education beyond high school. With the ever-changing workforce environment, proximity to the military bases and national laboratories, and employment shortages in critical fields, New Mexicans will need opportunities to continue to learn and grow their skills for career success and family-sustaining wages" (p. 2.).

The Colorado Department of Higher Education also exemplified this view, stating that

> "Colorado graduates benefit … from readiness to join the labor market equipped with the high-demand, highly competitive skills required for them to thrive in their unique career pathways."

By focusing on job skills and career pathways, these policy texts eschew BAI's mission to prepare students for democratic participation (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011). The quotes above uplift career outcomes, competitiveness, and wages as indicators of quality of life, which are inarguably important. However, they also frame quality of life largely in terms of the acquisition of human capital at the expense of connectedness to community and civic participation.

PDA explores policy silences, one of which we discovered related to the BAIs' regional service missions. If states mentioned the BAIs' regional service missions, they were couched in economic terms and centered on the production of workers—civic engagement was almost entirely absent from state funding models. While this economic focus is not unique to BAIs, funding models that confine BAIs' regional service missions to workforce development limit their capacity to serve communities in broader ways, including through civic engagement, applied research, and community development. The South Dakota Board of Regents exemplifies this tendency: "By delivering affordable, high-quality education, aligned to the current and future workforce needs of the state, the six Regental institutions are the foundation for the economic well-being of South Dakota." The Regents acknowledge the value of applied research, but again, the focus was on economic outputs: "Between FY05 and FY21, the Governor's Research Center Program has funded 18 research centers; leveraging the state's investment of $57,063,913 to garner $282,871,510 in external funding from federal and private sources. Additionally, the research centers have generated more than 20 startup companies, employing over 200 individuals in South Dakota today."

While the dominant policy discourse constructing education's mission connects the system's purposes to its economic development role (Orphan et al., 2020), this focus on economic development at the exclusion of community development discursively narrows the broader BAI regional service missions. Many funding models reduce BAIs' roles to outputs measured by FTE, which fails to capture BAIs' service to part-time students or the full costs of retaining and graduating part-time students. In these ways, we find that states discursively constructed the BAI mission in narrow ways.

How State Funding Models Construct Equity

Despite the states positioning BAIs as crucial for fostering access, their funding models often failed to address the real costs of supporting student-centered practices essential for retention, particularly for marginalized students. By prioritizing the production of graduates in fields aligned with state labor demands, the funding models often framed equity as an economic issue and de-prioritized addressing the structural barriers faced by marginalized students. Montana's and New Mexico's performance-based funding formulas, for example, incentivize degree completions for marginalized students, particularly in high-demand sectors such as STEM and health care, yet do not allocate funds for support services, such as advising and mental health resources, which are essential for retaining these students. While institutions may allocate funds to support services on their own, the funding models failed to acknowledge support services as an appropriate use of funds. By focusing on degree completion at the expense of the holistic support students may require to meet this milestone, these models further constructed students as economic actors irrespective of social context and lived experience. As a result,

these models tended to narrowly frame equity as economic mobility, while overlooking racism and other forms of oppression that may structure student success.

Without acknowledging the financial demands of serving marginalized students, we find that these funding models additionally risk reinforcing inequities rather than supporting BAIs in fulfilling their equity-focused missions. Oregon's outcomes-based funding formula offers a more nuanced approach to this issue, and includes a "sequential bonus [50-60%]...for degrees earned by low-income, rural, veteran, or underrepresented students...based on the number of populations" and "a 20% bonus...for degrees earned in high-demand, high-reward fields including STEM, health, and bilingual education." Thus, the formula rewards degree production for marginalized students across the disciplines and includes in its industry measure bilingual education.

Notably, some state models remain silent on or actively reject racial equity and other identity-based considerations. Wyoming's model, for example, intentionally disavowed equity by removing funding for minoritized students. The Wyoming legislature's most recent budget eliminated funding for the Office of Multicultural Affairs and attempted to bar state dollars from supporting diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives: "No funds from this appropriation shall be expended on the office of diversity, equity and inclusion at the University of Wyoming or on any diversity, equity and inclusion program, activity or function" (Wyoming HB001 House Enrolled Act 50 2024, p. 34). While the governor approved the elimination of funding for the Office of Multicultural Affairs, he vetoed the broader elimination of funding for all diversity initiatives. In so doing, he offered the following justification,

> "Without this targeted veto, the legislature will have inadvertently put millions of dollars of federal grants … at risk. These grants are vital to research and other core purposes of the University, but with the condition that the recipients extend opportunities to participate to underrepresented populations including veterans, Native Americans, and people with disabilities. These grant-required inclusion efforts are much broader than LBGTQ+ or others that our Legislature may believe are the only populations for which inclusion efforts are intended. Clearly Wyoming need not pursue any 'woke' agenda and I have encouraged the University to drop such nonsense."

In this statement, Governor Gordon notes that removing funding for diversity, equity, and inclusion harms the university's research mission by jeopardizing federal grants that prioritize inclusion and student groups the predominantly Republican legislature might find more deserving. He then clarifies that providing targeted support for LGBTQIA+ and others—likely non-Indigenous racially minoritized students— was unnecessary. While the state's financial disinvestment in diversity, equity, and inclusion limits the University of Wyoming's capacity to uphold its access and student-centeredness missions, its rhetorical disavowal of these goals deems some students unworthy of additional funding.

The states' models discursive construction of equity generally centered low-income students, and ignored racially marginalized students, suggesting an implicit preference for students whose paths align with state economic goals and political ideologies. The absence of explicit racial equity metrics, coupled with policy decisions that actively defund diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts, signals resistance to addressing the complex, intersectional barriers faced by these populations. By constructing equity in limited, economically driven, and racially neutral ways, state models invisibilize racially minoritized students and position BAIs as universal access points rather than student-centered institutions committed to meeting diverse student needs.

Institutional Hierarchies

Institutional hierarchies within state funding models position BAIs as secondary to non-BAIs. Funding practices in North Dakota and Nevada, for example, award graduate credit completion at significantly higher levels than undergraduate credits as well as completion of degrees more likely to be offered at non-BAIs. In North Dakota's model, the weights for health science credits are "3.0 for lower division credits; 6.0 for upper division credits; 9.0 for professional level credits; 12.0 for graduate level credits; and 34.5 for medical school credits," while the weights for core curriculum course credits are "1.0 for lower division credits; 2.0 for upper division credits; 3.0 for professional level credits; and 4.0 for graduate level credits." While graduate programs are more expensive to administer, and many BAIs have them, state models that incentivize graduate degree awards more than undergraduate degree awards carry implications for the BAI mission to serve undergraduate students first. Similarly, Utah's model rewards completions in "high-yield awards" often found at non-BAIs (e.g., law, pharmacy, dentistry). By failing to recognize BAIs missions and hierarchizing funding models, the models systematically privilege non-BAIs by directing resources to them, while BAIs face cyclical funding challenges that compromise their contributions to students and communities.

Discussion

In answer to our first research question, we found notable differences in how states recognized and supported the comprehensive BAI mission. Eight states explicitly acknowledged this mission, while others varied in their support for student retention, holistic needs, and equity. States often discursively framed BAIs as workforce engines designed to align educational outcomes with state labor needs, thus subordinating their regional service and equity missions, and demonstrating how states inadequately resource BAIs to fulfill their comprehensive missions (Layzell 2007). While some state models included equity incentives, they were often tied to economic productivity rather than addressing the needs of racially minoritized students.

In answer to our second research question, how do states use funding models to maintain differentiated postsecondary systems, funding models prioritized non-BAIs, relegating BAIs to secondary roles, which we argue limits their ability to fulfill their comprehensive missions and perpetuates institutional hierarchies. In this way, states maintained differentiated systems, but differentiation was based on institutional status and resources rather than institutional missions (Kumar, 2022). Hierarchization was evident in the "equal per-student funding" metric, as all states, except Wyoming, scored zero on this metric, highlighting systemic funding discrepancies extant across institution types. While we used a measure of horizontal equity in our assessment of per-student funding (Ward et al., 2020), Richmond and colleagues (2024) argued for vertical equity as a standard for assessing state funding models by how they concentrate resources among students with the highest needs. Such a funding approach would contribute to differentiation in state funding models by acknowledging that BAI students would benefit from greater resources to be successful.

In answer to our third question, funding models discursively constructed BAIs as engines of workforce and economic development, with access and equity imperatives frequently relegated to secondary considerations. Some models (e.g., Oregon) acknowledged regional service and civic engagement but these activities were generally subordinated to states' economic priorities. Notably, BAIs transcend institutional type and comprise regional public universities, flagships, and land-grant universities (Crisp et al., 2019). That said, these limited constructions of BAIs' purpose and contributions especially affect

how regional BAIs are constructed and valued in funding models, reinforcing structural hierarchies that privilege non-BAIs, fuel chronic underfunding of BAIs, and erode the comprehensive BAI mission. These decisions reveal policymaker subscription to the belief that BAIs cannot be "all things to all people," as we found evidence that many funding models narrowed the BAI mission to workforce and economic development, rather than adequately acknowledging the comprehensive missions with which these institutions were founded (Supplee & Orphan, 2023).

Policy Implications

We used critical emancipatory theory to expose the flows of power and resources in state funding models (Felix & Nienhusser, 2023), which revealed several harms to BAIs and their students. For example, only a few states funded holistic or basic student needs, despite research demonstrating these are key barriers to student success (McKibben & Qarni, 2022). Likewise, only a few states incentivized affordability via tuition freezes, which perhaps is unsurprising given that states often use higher education as the balance wheel for budgets as institutions can generate revenue through tuition, and states are hesitant to limit institutional tuition-setting authority (Hillman et al., 2024). Few states had policies that supported racially minoritized students, creating harms for these students who often have lower educational outcomes due, in large part, to the funding disparities their institutions experience (Ahlman et a., 2019; Cummings et al., 2021; Horn et al., 2023). Another harm created by some state funding models for the regions BAIs serve is the lack of acknowledgement of their community development/public service missions and overemphasis of their economic development missions. Prior research about Colorado BAIs shows that in the absence of state funding, administrators viewed their institution's community development mission as their responsibility to fulfill (Orphan & Laderman, 2024). As such, we have concerns about the narrowing of the BAI mission to foster workforce development, which carries implications for the communities they serve.

Some states explicitly named BAIs and funded them using mission-centered metrics, whereas other states only differentiated institutions by their two-year and four-year status, and still other states applied the same funding metrics and approach to all institutions regardless of mission. These policy choices may homogenize state postsecondary systems into two sectors, rather than three or more, and could harm mission differentiation and institutional diversity statewide (Loganecker, 2008).

Implications for Research

Our study builds on prior research exploring funding adequacy in education by using this concept to explore how state funding models adequately account for different postsecondary institutional types (Augenblick et al., 1997; Kelchen et al., 2023; Richmond et al., 2024; Ward et al., 2020). In doing so, we create possibilities for research exploring how state funding models adequately account for other institutional types such as land grant universities and community colleges. In resonance with prior research (e.g., Taylor & Cantwell, 2019), we also uncovered unequal per-student funding for BAIs as compared with non-BAIs, which contributes to hierarchical postsecondary systems (Kumar, 2022). In contribution to the literature on mission differentiation, we show how state funding models either support or erode differentiated missions across public postsecondary institutions. We invite future research into those states that scored highly on mission differentiation, so that scholars and policymakers might understand how these states are achieving these outcomes.

In using critical emancipatory theory and PDA, we revealed the dominant discourses operating about BAIs in some states (Allan et al., 2019), namely that BAIs are workforce generators and that the differential experiences of racially minoritized students are irrelevant to state policy and funding priorities (Squire et al., 2019). We critical emancipatory theory to be a fitting pairing with a normative research method (content analysis) and a critical one (PDA) that allowed us to expose differences in state funding models and the adequacy with which they acknowledged the BAI mission. We invite future theoretical and empirical examinations into state funding models, perhaps in the remaining 36 states, that ask similar questions and use or modify our scorecard.

Our study used a simple measure of transparency – we invite more investigation into funding transparency so that we can better understand how states convey their budget models and priorities to the broader public. For example, researchers might assess state funding dashboards to understand how easy they are to understand. We also look forward to continued work exploring funding adequacy in higher education so that we can advance common definitions, metrics, and assessments of this important concept. Finally, as policymaker rhetoric continues to perpetuate the notion that BAIs cannot be "all things to all people" (Ellis, 2019), we hope our work encourages future research into the consequences of state policymakers narrowing of the BAI mission to workforce and economic development, at the expense of the sector's community development mission and its racial equity imperatives.

References

Ahlman, L., Cochrane, D., & Gonzalez, V. (2019). *Dire disparities: Patterns of racially inequitable funding and student success in public postsecondary education*. The Institute for College Access. https://ticas.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/dire-disparities.pdf

Allan, A.J. & Tolbert, A.R. (2019). Advancing Social Justice with Policy Discourse Analysis. In K. K. Strunk & L.A. Locke (Eds.), *Research Methods for Social Justice and Equity in Education* (pp. 137-149). Palgrave Macmillan.

Augenblick, J. G., Myers, J. L., & Anderson, A. B. (1997). Equity and adequacy in school funding. *The Future of Children*, *7*(3), 63–78. https://doi.org/10.2307/1602446

Baker, V. L., Lunsford, L. G., & Pifer, M. J. (2017). *Developing faculty in liberal arts colleges: Aligning individual needs and organizational goals*. Rutgers University Press.

Bennett, C. & Law, M. (2021). Theoretical model for applying agency and resource dependency to public higher education. *Research in Higher Education*, *39*, 1-7.

Clark, Burton. 1987. *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton University Press.

Crisp, G., Horn, C. L., Kuczynski, M., Zhou, Q., & Cook, E. (2019). Describing and differentiating four-year broad access institutions: An empirical typology. *Review of Higher Education, 42*(4), 1373-1400. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0069

Crisp, G., McClure, I. R., & Orphan, C. M. (Eds.). (2021). *Unlocking opportunity through broadly accessible institutions*. Routledge/Taylor and Francis Group.

Cummings, K., Laderman, S., Lee, J., Tandberg, D., & Weeden, D. (2021). *Investigating the impacts of state higher education appropriations and financial Aid*. State Higher Education Executive Officers Association: https://sheeo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/SHEEO_ImpactAppropationsFinancialAid.pdf.

de Alva, J. K. (2019). Is the university next door the way to upward mobility? American Enterprise Institute Website. Is-the-University-Next-Door-the-Way-to-Upward-Mobility.pdf

Drisko, J. & Maschi, T. (2015). *Content analysis*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, L. (2019, July 3). This five-word phrase has become a mantra for slashing college budgets. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. https://www.chronicle.com/article/this-5-word-phrase-has-become-a-mantra-for-slashing-college-budgets/

Felix, E. R. & Nienhusser, H. K. (2023). Humanizing policy implementation in higher education through an equity-centered approach. Annenberg Brown University. *EdWorkingPaper*, *23*(806).

Foucault, M., & Senellart, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France, 1978-79*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Hillman, N., Dziesinski, A., You, E. (2024). *Designing higher education funding models to promote student success: An introduction to "capacity-building" and "equity-based" funding principles*. Student Success Through Applied Research (STAR) Lab. https://sstar.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/EquityFundReport.pdf

Horn, Aaron S., Olena G. Horner, David A. Tandberg, Robert K. Toutkoushian, and Shaun N. Williams-Wyche. The Effect of State Appropriations on College Graduation Rates of Diverse Students. *Journal of Education Finance* 49(1): 26 64. https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/jef.2023.a908610.

Horn, A. S., Horner, O. G., Tandberg, D. A., Toutkoushian, R. K., & Williams-Wyche, S. N. (2023). The effect of state appropriations on college graduation rates of diverse students. *Journal of Education Finance*, *49*(1), 26-64.

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). (2022). 12 month enrollment. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Kelchen, R., Lingo, M., Baker, D.J, Rosinger, K., Ortagus, J., & Wu, J. (2024). A Typology and Landscape of State Funding Formulas for Public Colleges and Universities from 2004 to 2021. *The Review of Higher Education*. Vol. 47, No. 3. pp. 281-314.

Kelchen, R., Ortagus, J., Baker, D., & Rosinger, K. (2023). *Trends in State Funding for Public Higher Education*. Policy Brief. InformedStates Higher Education Policy Initiative.

Kelchen, R., & Horn, A. (2022). *State funding approaches for public colleges and universities in the midwest*. Midwestern Higher Education Compact. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED623429.pdf

Koricich, A., Sansone, V. A., Fryar, A. H., Orphan, C. M. & McClure, K. R. (2022). *Introducing our nation's rural-serving postsecondary institutions: Moving toward greater visibility and appreciation.* Alliance for Research on Regional Colleges. https://www.regionalcolleges.org/project/ruralserving

Kumar, A. (2022). The origins and evolution of academic drift at the California State University, 1960-2005. *Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00832-w

Layzell, D.T. (2007). State Higher Education Funding Models: An Assessment of Current and Emerging Approaches. *Journal of Education Finance*, 33(1), PP. 1-19. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40704312

Longanecker, D. A. (2008). *Getting what you pay for: Mission differentiation vs. mission creep: Higher education's battle between creationism and evolution*. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. https://www.wiche.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/2008-Longanecker-Mission-Differentiation.pdf

McKibben, B. & Qarni, A. (2022, June). Helping students meet basic needs to support their success. MDRC. https://www.mdrc.org/work/publications/helping-students-meet-basic-needs-support-their-success

Orphan, C. M. (2018). Public purpose under pressure: Examining the effects of neoliberal public policy on the missions of regional comprehensive universities. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 22*(2), 59-101. https://du.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/public-purpose-under-pressure-examining-effects/docview/2101592742/se-2

Orphan, C. M., Gildersleeve, R. E. & Mills, A. P. (2020). State of rhetoric: Neoliberal discourses for education in state of the state addresses and gubernatorial press releases. *Journal of Education Policy*, *35*(3), 394-420.

Orphan, C. M. & Laderman, S. (2024). Policy as Potemkin Village: Regional public university non-responsiveness to the implementation of performance funding in Colorado. *Journal of Higher Education*, *95*(2), 256-283.

Orphan, C. M., & McClure, K. R. (2019). An anchor for the region: Examining a regional comprehensive university's efforts to serve its rural, Appalachian community. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, *35*,9, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.26209/jrre3509

Orphan, C. M., & McClure, K. R. (2022). An expanded vision of the value of postsecondary education: Regional public universities as broadly accessible anchor institutions. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 54(6), 26-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2022.2128013

Orphan, C. M., Romero, D., & Diaz Solodukhin, L. (2018). Fostering collective impact: Measuring and advancing higher education's contributions to civic health and equity in Colorado. *International Journal of Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement*, *6*(1), 1-20. https://ijrslce.scholasticahq.com/article/6981-fostering-collectiveimpact-measuring-and-advancing-higher-education-s-contributions-to-civic-health-andequity-in-colorado

Orphan, C. M., Wetherbee, M., & Duncan, B. (2022). *Identifying, Defining, and Supporting Regional Public Universities and Colleges*. Alliance for Research on Regional Colleges. [Technical report.] https://assets.website-files.com/5fd3cd8b31d72c5133b17425/639f1833beb26a26ffafbc8a_IADRPUs%20Full%20Report.pdf

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford Business Books, 2003.

Richmond, M., Hahnel, C., Harding, L., & Lee, N. (2024). *Strengthening state higher education funding: Lessons learned from K-12*. Bellwether.

Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (Eds.). (2011). *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education*. Temple University Press.

Squire, D., Nicolazzo, Z, Perez, R. J. (2019). Institutional responses as non-performative: What university communications (Don't) say about movements towards justice. *The Review of Higher Education*, *42*(Supplement 2019), 109-133.

Supplee, L. & Orphan, C. M. (2023). The "people's universities" over time: Tracing the histories and evolutions of regional comprehensive universities as anchor institutions between 1970 – 2000. *The Review of Higher Education*, *46*(4), 517-546.

Taylor, B. J. & Cantwell, B. (2019). *Unequal higher education: Wealth, status and student opportunity.* Rutgers University Press.

Turk, J. M. (2021). The role of accessible colleges and universities in promoting racial equity in access to and completion of bachelor's degrees. In G. Crisp, K. R. McClure, & C. M. Orphan (Eds.), *Unlocking opportunity through broadly accessible institutions*. Routledge.

Ward, J.D., Pisacreta, E.D., Weintraut, B., & Kurzweil, M. (2020). An overview of state higher education funding approaches. Ithaka S + R. https://sr.ithaka.org/publications/an-overview-of-state-higher-education-funding-approaches/

Wellman, J. (2011). Financial characteristics of broad access public institutions. Stanford University, Center for Education Policy Analysis. http://cepa.stanford.edu/conference-papers/financial-characteristics-broad-access-public-institutions.

WICHE. (n.d.). *The WICHE Commission*. https://www.wiche.edu/about/wiche-commission/

TABLE 1
CODES AND EXAMPLE TEXT

CODE	EXAMPLE TEXT
BAIS	"An allocation for financial stability of the regional universities to ensure geographic access to higher education for all Oregonians."
MISSION DIFFERENTIATION	"This component provides funding in recognition of the unique regional, research, and public service missions of the universities."
EQUITY	"The funding model is based upon the premise that state funding for instruction must be equitable to all…"
FUNDING INEQUITIES*	"The underlying message in this analysis was that the six South Dakota Regental institutions were all underfunded…"
FUNDING MODEL	"An allocation to support funding adequacy of fixed costs. Includes a flat amount of $2.9 million for all seven public universities."
BAI MISSION DOMAINS	
REGIONAL SERVICE	
WORKFORCE OR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT*	"This funding model ... is intended to motivate institutional behavior to increase degree productivity, contribute to the State's economy…"
ENCOURAGES CIVIC ENGAGEMENT*	"The System Center for Civic Engagement will provide undergraduate students across the Regental system with the foundation to succeed as lifelong citizens …"
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDING*	"(ii) Conducting all computational and practical research to the greatest extent reasonably possible with University of Wyoming students within Wyoming; (iii)…"
COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH OR APPLIED RESEARCH	"To create new basic knowledge, develop solutions for technical and social problems, improve the quality of the faculty, contribute to the quality of undergraduate and graduate instruction programs, and strengthen the State's high-technology economic base by undertaking sponsored basic and applied research projects."
AGRICULTURE	"…to be used solely for support for excellence in research, education and extension in ranch and rangeland management, agronomy and soil science."
STEM	"Awards conferred in economic development interest areas including STEM…"
CULTURAL PROGRAMMING IN SERVICE TO REGION (E.G., MUSEUMS, FESTIVALS, ETC.)*	"Of this general fund appropriation, two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000.00) is to support the University of Wyoming rodeo team."
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	"Governor Ducey made significant investments to support Arizona universities during the pandemic."
INDUSTRY SPECIFIC TO STATE OR REGION	"And there are several provisions adding over $20 million to the School of Energy Resources for building nuclear energy capacity…"
STUDENT-CENTEREDNESS	
RETENTION	"Considered the retention of resident registration fees and nonresident tuition ..."
COMPLETION	"Degrees/certificates awarded which includes sub-metrics for underserved populations."
HOLISTIC STUDENT SUPPORTS	"Institutions' resources need to be focused differently where there are increasing numbers of students with greater academic and other support needs to ensure their success."
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT	"Reviewed the funding of remediation…"
POSTSECONDARY ACCESS	

ADULT LEARNERS	"Under-represented/at-risk populations measured include: 1) American Indians, 2) low-income students (Pell recipients), veterans, and nontraditional students (25+ years or older)."
FIRST-GENERATION STUDENT	"The university also serves many first-generation students, with approximately one third of enrolled students reporting as first generation ..."
IMMIGRANTS	"Recent immigrants frequently need some foundations education to prepare them for further education in this country..."
LOW-INCOME	"Awards to Financially At-Risk Students (defined by expected family contribution for those receiving aid)."
RURAL STUDENTS	"'Rural Students' are first time-freshmen resident undergraduate students who are graduates of high schools designated by the National Education Statistics Locale Codes as follows: 'Rural; Distant', 'Rural; Fringe', 'Rural; Remote', 'Town; Distant', 'Town; Fringe' or 'Town: Remote'."
RACIALLY MINORITIZED STUDENTS	"Driving the shortage of college credentials and degrees are the persistent gaps in college access and completion by race and ethnicity."
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES*	"The effort would convene experts in disability services from many different state institutions of higher education and system offices (area technical colleges, two-year, and four-year institutions), agencies with a vested interest, individuals from the disability community..."
UPWARD MOBILITY (OR SOCIAL MOBILITY)	"A college education foments economic mobility, builds human capital, and increases lifetime earnings."
VETERANS OR SERVICE MEMBERS	"Proceeds from the system's series 2021C tax-exempt revenue and revenue refunding bonds (approximately $34.16 million) will be used to finance ... Veterans services projects."

Note. *Indicates emergent codes. All other codes were inductive codes.

TABLE 2
STATE SCORING RUBRIC

CATEGORY	METRICS
MISSION DIFFERENTIATION (4 POINTS)	Explicit mention of BAI mission? (Yes = 2 pts, No = 0 pts)
	Differentiated funding models? (Yes = 2 points, No = 0)
BAI COMPREHENSIVE MISSION (7 POINTS)	**STUDENT-CENTEREDNESS (2 POINTS POSSIBLE)**
	No time-based completion metrics (Yes = .5 pts, No = 0 pts)
	Retention (Yes = .5 pts, No = 0 pts)
	Incentive/funding for student support services (Yes = .5 pts, No = 0 pts)
	Incentives/funding for holistic student needs (e.g., housing, mental health, food, etc.) (Yes = .5 pts, No = 0 pts)
	REGIONAL SERVICE/WELLBEING (2 POINTS POSSIBLE)
	Community Development/public service (Yes = 1 pt, No = 0 pts)
	Economic/workforce development (Yes = 1 pt, No = 0 pts)
	POSTSECONDARY ACCESS (2 POINTS POSSIBLE)
	Funding model incentivizes low admissions barriers (Yes = .5 pt, No = 0 pts)
	Funding model incentivizes enrollment of state residents (Yes = .5 pt, No = 0 pts)
	Tuition freeze incentives (Yes = 0.5 pt, No = 0 pts)
	state financial aid to marginalized students (Yes = 0.5 pt, No = 0 pts)
	EQUITY (1 POINT POSSIBLE)
	Funding model incentivizes BAIs to foster equity across the three mission domains (Yes = 1 pt, No = 0 pts)
FUNDING ALLOCATIONS (3 POINTS)	Equal per-student funding across all four-year publics? (Yes = 1 pt, No = 0 pts)
	Headcount used? (Yes = 2 pt, No = 0 pts)
TRANSPARENCY (1 POINT)	State has legislation or policy guidance that is intended to promote transparency around funding for higher education (Yes = 1 pt, No = 0 pts)
TOTAL POINTS	**15**

TABLE 3
STATE SCORES

	AZ	CA	CO	HI	ID	MT	NV	NM	ND	OR	SD	UT	WA	WY
MISSION DIFFERENTIATION														
EXPLICIT MENTION OF BAI MISSION	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	1	1	2
DIFFERENTIATED STATE FUNDING MODEL	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	0	2
BAI COMPREHENSIVE MISSION														
STUDENT-CENTEREDNESS														
NO TIME-BASED COMPLETION METRICS	.5	0	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	0	.5	0	0
RETENTION	0	0	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	0	.5	0	0	.5	.5
INCENTIVES/ FUNDING FOR STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	0	.5	0	0	.5	.5
INCENTIVES/FUNDING FOR HOLISTIC STUDENT NEEDS	.5	.5	0	.5	.5	.5	0	.5	0	0	0	0	.5	.5
REGIONAL SERVICE/WELLBEING														
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT/PUBLIC SERVICE	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
ECONOMIC/WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
POSTSECONDARY ACCESS														
FUNDING MODEL INCENTIVIZES LOW ADMISSIONS BARRIERS	0	.5	.5	0	.5	.5	.5	.5	0	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5
FUNDING MODEL INCENTIVIZES ENROLLMENT OF STATE RESIDENTS	0	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	0	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5
TUITION FREEZE INCENTIVES	.5	0	.5	0	.5	0	0	0	0	0	.5	0	.5	0
STATE FINANCIAL AID FOR MARGINALIZED STUDENTS	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	0	.5	.5	0
EQUITY														
FUNDING MODEL INCENTIVIZES BAIS TO FOSTER EQUITY ACROSS THE THREE MISSION DOMAINS	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
FUNDING ALLOCATIONS														
EQUAL PER-STUDENT FUNDING ACROSS ALL FOUR-YEAR PUBLICS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
HEADCOUNT USED	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
TRANSPARENCY														
STATE HAS LEGISLATION OR POLICY GUIDANCE THAT IS INTENDED TO PROMOTE TRANSPARENCY AROUND FUNDING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
TOTAL POINTS	7.5	10.5	11.5	10	11	11.5	13	13.5	5	11	6.5	7	8.5	10.5

Note: Postal code state abbreviations used.

APPENDIX A
STATE LAWS

	STATUTE NUMBER	LINK
ARIZONA	Arizona Revised Statutes §§ 15-1626, 15-1661, 15-1662 (2024)	Retrieved from https://www.azleg.gov/ars/
CALIFORNIA	California Education Code §§ 89772, 92495 (2024)	Retrieved from https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/
COLORADO	Colorado Revised Statutes Title 23, Article 18 (2024)	Retrieved from https://leg.colorado.gov/colorado-revised-statutes
HAWAI'I	Hawai'i Revised Statutes §§ 304A-2101, 304A-2153 (2024)	Retrieved from https://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/
IDAHO	Idaho Code §§ 33-2802, 33-3725 (2024)	Retrieved from https://legislature.idaho.gov/statutesrules/idstat/
MONTANA	Montana Code Annotated § 15-10-109 (2024)	Retrieved from https://leg.mt.gov/bills/mca_toc/
NEVADA	Nevada Revised Statutes §§ 396.370–396.380 (2024)	Retrieved from https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/
NEW MEXICO	New Mexico Statutes Annotated §§ 21-1-27.1, 21-13-24.1 (2024)	Retrieved from https://nmonesource.com/nmos/en/nav.do
NORTH DAKOTA	North Dakota Century Code Chapter 15-10 (2024)	Retrieved from https://www.legis.nd.gov/cencode/t15c10.html
OREGON	Oregon Revised Statutes §§ 350.075, 352.087 (2024)	Retrieved from https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/ORS.aspx
SOUTH DAKOTA	South Dakota Codified Laws Title 13, Chapter 49 (2024)	Retrieved from https://sdlegislature.gov/Statutes/Codified_Laws
UTAH	Utah Code §§ 53B-7-703 – 53B-7-708 (2024)	Retrieved from https://le.utah.gov/xcode/code.html
WASHINGTON	Revised Code of Washington §§ 28B.15.067, 28B.92.010 (2024)	Retrieved from https://app.leg.wa.gov/rcw/
WYOMING	Wyoming Statutes §§ 21-17-105, 9-4-601 (2024	Retrieved from https://wyoleg.gov/Legislation/WYStatutes