

FISCAL INCIDENCE OF EXPENDITURE ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN SA: 2000 & 2006

Pierre de Villiers
University of Stellenbosch



OUTLINE OF PRESENTATION

- Methodology
- Data collection
 - Funds
 - Student numbers
- Results

Methodology

- Problems comparisons
- Headcounts & FE numbers
- Contact & distance students
- Social Sciences and Natural sciences

Classification of education subject matter (CESM) into funding groups

Funding group	CESM categories included in funding group
1	07 Education, 13 Law, 14 Librarianship, 20 Psychology, 21 Social Services/Public Administration
2	04 Business/Commerce, 05 Communication, 06 Computer Sciences, 12 Languages, 18 Philosophy/Religion, 22 Social Sciences
3	02 Architecture/Planning, 08 Engineering, 10 Home Economics, 11 Industrial Arts, 16 Mathematical Sciences, 19 Physical Education
4	01 Agriculture, 03 Fine and Performing Arts, 09 Health Sciences, 15 Life and Physical Sciences

DATA COLLECTION

- Expenditure on HE from Estimates of National Expenditure
- Not included
 - Restructuring or unallocated (not link HEI)
 - NSFAS

Student numbers

- Headcount from Education at a Glance
- Racial group per institution
- Expenditure in HEIs same irrespective of race
- Amount each HEI for each racial group added
- Amount divided by accumulated students per race

Headcount (all students)

Race	2000		2006	
Afr	10 769	103.4	9 914	94.9
Ind	11 306	108.5	10 131	96.9
Col	10 995	105.6	10 845	103.9
Whi	10 413	100	10 451	100

Headcounts (contact)

- Distance students receive half subsidy of full-time students
- Subtract distance student numbers
- Subtract their part of subsidies paid to HEIs
- Then repeat process as before

Headcount (contact)

Race	2000		2006	
Afr	13 147	97.0	13 112	89.9
Ind	15 825	116.7	15 644	107.3
Col	13 914	102.6	14 225	97.6
Whi	13 557	100	14 582	100

FE student numbers

- FE numbers fraction of headcounts
- 2000: Total FE numbers from Steyn & de Villiers report CHE
- 2006: From Education Statistics
- Assume racial composition identical to headcounts
- Expenditure in each HEI identical irrespective of race
- Repeat calculations as before

FE student numbers (all)

Race	2000		2006	
Afr	15 701	97.9	14 670	93.7
Ind	16 644	103.8	15 569	99.5
Col	15 965	99.5	15 839	101.2
Whi	16 040	100	15 654	100

FE student numbers (contact)

Race	2000		2006	
Afr	19 004	92.6	17 147	90.3
Ind	21 625	105.3	20 043	105.5
Col	19 168	93.4	18 476	97.3
Whi	20 532	100	18 989	100

FE student numbers per field of study (Ns & Ss)

- Use same FE numbers as before
- Educ website: Unduplicated student enrolment according to HEI, race, gender & CESM category
- % each racial group at each HEI calculated
- Convert FE numbers to racial breakdown in Ns and Ss
- Ns receive 2.55 more than Ss

FE student numbers – Ns & Ss(all)

Race	2000		2006	
○ Afr	15 041	87.6	14 681	88.1
○ Ind	17 992	104.7	16 461	100.8
○ Col	15 523	90.4	15 030	92.0
○ Whi	17 178	100	16 331	100

FE student numbers – Ns & Ss (contact students)

- FE distance students removed
- Their subsidy removed
- Divided between contact students

FE student numbers – Ns & Ss (contact students)

Race	2000		2006	
○ Afr	18 125	82.2	16 886	84.3
○ Ind	23 821	108	21 606	107.9
○ Col	18 727	84.9	17 572	87.8
○ Whi	22 052	100	20 021	100

Students field of study (FE all)

Race	2000		2006	
	Ss	Ns	Ss	Ns
○ Afr	74.0	26.0	71.9	28.1
○ Ind	61.1	38.9	66.8	33.2
○ Col	70.4	29.6	72.3	27.7
○ Whi	64.5	35.5	66.2	33.8

CONCLUSIONS

- Ind & whi receive in general more than col & bl
- More take courses in Ns
- Difference between funding Uni & tech (2000) and comprehensive uni & univ of tech
- In real terms subsidies for all groups decreased with all methods
- School problem – not enough take maths & science

