

*A GREAT PLAINS NETWORK*

*RESEARCH REPORT*

# NSF AND NIH AWARD TRENDS FOR THE GREAT PLAINS: 2002 TO 2005

Prepared by

**GREGORY E. MONACO, PH.D., DIRECTOR**

**GREAT PLAINS NETWORK**

AND

**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**



***GPN Reports*** are prepared as a service to assist GPN member universities to remain current on the latest technology, research trends and research opportunities. To learn more about the Great Plains Network, including membership and sponsorship opportunities, or to join the GPN distribution list please visit <http://www.greatplains.net> or contact Dr. Greg Monaco, [greg@greatplains.net](mailto:greg@greatplains.net).

Thanks to Jerome Frieman, Ph.D., Kansas State University, for his thoughtful suggestions on data organization and analysis.

# NSF and NIH Award Trends: 2002 to 2005

## Table of Contents

1 Summary .....	4
2 Introduction.....	4
3 Findings .....	4
3.1 Funding Comparison: 2002 and 2005 Data .....	5
3.2 GPN vs. US: Funding, Graduate Students, Population Data .....	6
3.3 Predicting Awards and Funding Amounts .....	8
4 Conclusion.....	9
5 References .....	10
6 Appendices.....	11
US Population and Graduate Students in Science and Engineering by State .....	12
FY2005 NSF Funding by State.....	13
FY2005 NIH Funding by State .....	14
Total & <i>Per Capita</i> Federal Spending by State for 2002-2003 [1].....	15
Changes in Funding between FY2002 and FY2005 .....	16
NSF Funding on a Per Graduate Student in Science, Engineering and <i>Per Capita</i> Basis.....	17
NIH Funding on a Per Graduate Student in Science, Engineering and <i>Per Capita</i> Basis.....	18

## 1 Summary

Population data from the 2000 Census, graduate student enrollment data for 2004, and National Science Foundation (NSF) and National Institutes of Health (NIH) award data for 2005 were obtained and analyzed for each state, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. In general, states with GPN members received fewer competitive award dollars on both a *per capita* and per graduate student basis than the US, as a whole, for 2005. The award data for 2005 was compared to similar data gathered for 2002. NIH and NSF showed total award dollar increases from 2002 to 2005, with a greater increase for NIH. The top 26 “best performers” in 2002 (most award dollars received) accounted for about 90% of the increase in funding in 2005. Between 2002 and 2005, states with GPN members increased dollars awarded from NIH but decreased dollars awarded from NSF. The NIH data suggest that, although states with GPN members have improved in terms of total competitive dollars from 2002 to 2005, many have fallen further behind in relation to the US, as a whole. Enrollment of graduate students in science emerged as the best single predictor for dollars awarded and number of awards for both NSF and NIH.

## 2 Introduction

In 2003, Dennis Brewer, Associate Vice Provost for Research, University of Arkansas, prepared an analysis of funding in the GPN region and the US as a whole [1]. That analysis compared competitive award dollars from NIH and NSF to direct congressional funding. When adjusted for population (i.e., on a *per capita* basis), states in the GPN region were ahead on congressional funding dollars by about \$17 million and behind on competitive award dollars by about \$700 million. (The data from the 2003 article are presented in Appendix IV.)

*This report updates the earlier report.* The data in this report differs from that of the earlier report in the following ways:

- NIH and NSF *award data is updated to 2005* to include both amount of funding and number of awards;
- The sample includes data for the *50 states, District of Columbia and Puerto Rico*;
- In addition to population data for each area, the *number of graduate students enrolled in science* and *graduate students enrolled in engineering* for each state is included;
- Adjustments to the 2005 data are done on both a *per capita* and a per graduate student basis; and
- Data on direct congressional funding is not included for 2005.

The complete data set is available in the appendices.

## 3 Findings

Initially, I looked at the 2005 award data from NIH and NSF and compared it to the 2002 award data. I then compared how states with GPN members performed to the national average. Finally, I looked at three variables to determine the best predictor of funding.

### 3.1 Funding Comparison: 2002 and 2005 Data

I added the 2002 NSF and NIH award data for Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia to Brewer's data. I then compared overall NSF and NIH budgets for 2002 and 2005. The NSF budget increased 14% or \$.65 billion while the NIH budget increased 22% or nearly \$4.2 billion from 2002 to 2005. All but 10 states showed increases in NSF competitive funding while all but 4 states showed increases in NIH competitive funding (Appendix V).

#### 3.1.1 COMPARISON OF TOP AND BOTTOM PERFORMERS

To create some performance benchmarks, I split the 52 states (including DC and Puerto Rico) into the top 26 and bottom 26 performers based on 2002 funding for each agency (Table 1) and then looked at how they performed in 2005. The top 26 NSF performers in 2002 reflected an aggregate increase of 15% in 2005 (about \$.6 billion) over their total award dollars for 2002. The bottom 26 NSF performers in 2002 reflected an increase of 12% (\$.06 billion). *The top 26 NSF performers in 2002 accounted for 91% of the NSF funding increase from 2002 to 2005.*

The top 26 NIH performers in 2002 showed an aggregate funding increase of 22% (\$3.8 billion) while the bottom 26 showed an increase of roughly 24% (\$.4 billion) over 2002. *The top 26 2002 NIH performers accounted for 89% of the NIH funding increase from 2002 to 2005.*

<b>Table 1. Comparison of NSF and NIH Top 26 Performers versus Bottom 26 for 2002 vs. 2005</b>				
	<b>2002 Funding (K)</b>	<b>2005 Funding (K)</b>	<b>\$ Change (K)</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b>National Science Foundation</b>	\$4,535,655	\$5,188,020	\$652,365	14%
Top 26 (FY2002)	\$3,986,447	\$4,574,062	\$587,615	15%
Bottom 26 (FY2002)	\$549,208	\$613,958	\$64,750	12%
<b>National Institutes of Health</b>	\$18,952,636	\$23,114,841	\$4,162,206	22%
Top 26 (FY2002)	\$17,371,014	\$21,161,065	\$3,790,051	22%
Bottom 26 (FY2002)	\$1,581,622	\$1,953,777	\$372,155	24%

#### 3.1.2 CHANGES IN FUNDING FROM 2002 TO 2005

Table 2 presents a portion of the funding data for states with GPN membership and other states in close proximity. The formula for change in funding (columns 4 & 7) is

$$\text{Change} = \frac{\text{2005 dollars} - \text{2002 dollars}}{\text{2002 dollars}}$$

For states with GPN membership, *three showed a relative decrease in funding from NSF* (Missouri, North Dakota and South Dakota) while only *one* (Kansas) *showed a relative decrease from NIH.*

The US, as a whole, reflected a 14% increase in NSF competitive funding, and the bottom 26 performers in 2002 had a "gain" of 12%. States with GPN membership

actually had *an aggregate "loss" of competitive funding of 2.2% or \$3.6 million in NSF funds.*

States with GPN membership had *an aggregate "gain" of 10.8% or about \$83 million in NIH competitive funding* from 2002 to 2005. Missouri is responsible for more than one-third of the gain. Nonetheless, the GPN gain of 10.8% is less than half of the aggregate "gain" of 24% for the bottom 26 NIH performers of 2002.

**Table 2. Changes in NSF and NIH Funding between FY2002 and FY2005 for Selected States (Losses in Red)**

State	NSF			NIH		
	\$K (FY02)	\$K (FY05)	Change in \$K	\$K (FY02)	\$K (FY05)	Change in \$K
<b>GPN States</b>	<b>\$163,710</b>	<b>\$160,079</b>	<b>(\$3,631)</b>	<b>\$766,851</b>	<b>\$849,787</b>	<b>\$82,936</b>
<b>US Total</b>	<b>\$4,535,655</b>	<b>\$5,188,020</b>	<b>\$652,365</b>	<b>\$18,952,636</b>	<b>\$23,114,841</b>	<b>\$4,162,206</b>
Arkansas	\$8,720	\$9,374	\$654	\$52,940	\$62,288	\$9,348
Colorado	\$220,083	\$228,455	\$8,372	\$296,518	\$346,726	\$50,208
Illinois	\$208,561	\$223,091	\$14,530	\$571,117	\$733,892	\$162,775
Iowa	\$33,366	\$41,093	\$7,727	\$181,620	\$193,025	\$11,405
Kansas	\$26,020	\$36,021	\$10,001	\$77,259	\$76,753	(\$506)
Kentucky	\$31,957	\$22,861	(\$9,096)	\$111,491	\$164,895	\$53,404
Louisiana	\$31,420	\$36,576	\$5,156	\$117,481	\$185,017	\$67,536
Minnesota	\$56,639	\$65,758	\$9,119	\$372,358	\$441,847	\$69,489
Mississippi	\$18,415	\$19,933	\$1,518	\$34,810	\$36,647	\$1,837
Missouri	\$63,566	\$50,792	(\$12,774)	\$481,994	\$511,713	\$29,719
Montana	\$24,386	\$27,751	\$3,365	\$25,623	\$43,236	\$17,613
Nebraska	\$19,444	\$20,415	\$971	\$61,633	\$75,906	\$14,273
North Dakota	\$10,873	\$10,226	(\$647)	\$13,603	\$20,740	\$7,137
Oklahoma	\$23,827	\$25,427	\$1,600	\$66,270	\$82,820	\$16,550
South Dakota	\$11,260	\$7,824	(\$3,436)	\$13,152	\$19,568	\$6,416
Tennessee	\$46,353	\$46,564	\$211	\$337,535	\$434,581	\$97,046
Texas	\$160,357	\$153,786	(\$6,571)	\$1,027,704	\$1,149,983	\$122,279
Wisconsin	\$98,480	\$152,125	\$53,645	\$338,611	\$387,749	\$49,138
Wyoming	\$10,004	\$10,308	\$304	\$7,318	\$6,294	(\$1,024)

### 3.2 GPN vs. US: Funding, Graduate Students, Population Data

Table 3 summarizes demographic, funding and award data for the US sample and the GPN region. The population data is from the 2000 US Census [4] and graduate enrollment data is from the National Science Foundation for the year 2004 [3].

**Table 3. Summary Statistics for US versus States with GPN Member Universities**

	All States <sup>1</sup>	GPN <sup>2</sup>	GPN as Percent
Population	285,230,516	17,515,990	6.1%
Graduate Students in Science	352,548	19,067	5.4%
Graduate Students in Engineering	123,701	6,284	5.1%
NSF Funding (FY2002) (\$K)	\$4,535,655	\$163,710	3.6%
NSF Funding (FY2005) (\$K)	\$5,188,020	\$160,079	3.1%
NSF Grants Awarded (2005)	20,346	804	4.0%
NIH Funding (FY2002) (\$K)	\$18,952,636	\$766,851	2.0%
NIH Funding (FY2005) (\$K)	\$23,114,841	\$849,787	3.7%
NIH Grants Awarded (2005)	53,769	2,049	3.8%

<sup>1</sup> 50 states plus District of Columbia and Puerto Rico

<sup>2</sup> Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, North Dakota, South Dakota

While the GPN region accounts for 6.1% of the entire population, 5.4% of all US graduate students in science and 5.1% of engineering graduate students were enrolled in universities in GPN states.

As a percent of the US total, the GPN region accounts for a somewhat smaller percentage of dollars awarded and number of awards for both NSF and NIH than might be predicted by any of the demographic measures.

### 3.2.1 GPN vs. US: PER CAPITA FUNDING

Brewer presented *per capita* Federal spending for each state as “a measure of the return that our citizens receive on their investment in the federal research enterprise” [1]. This is also a way to adjust total award dollars to a number that takes into account population differences among states and, hopefully, makes comparisons among states more meaningful.

Updated 2002 data (to include the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) and 2005 data are presented in Table 4 for NSF and NIH (complete data in Appendices).

State	NSF				NIH			
	\$ Per Capita 2002*	Rank	\$ Per Capita 2005	Rank	\$ Per Capita 2002*	Rank	\$ Per Capita 2005	Rank
<b>GPN</b>	<b>\$9.35</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$9.14</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$43.78</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$48.51</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>US</b>	<b>\$15.90</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$18.19</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$66.45</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$81.04</b>	<b>NA</b>
Arkansas	\$3.26	52	\$3.51	51	\$19.80	42	\$23.30	46
Kansas	\$9.68	38	\$13.40	30	\$28.74	33	\$28.55	41
Missouri	\$11.36	34	\$9.08	38	\$86.14	11	\$91.46	12
Nebraska	\$11.36	33	\$11.93	36	\$36.02	31	\$44.36	32
North Dakota	\$16.93	19	\$15.92	26	\$21.18	41	\$32.30	39
Oklahoma	\$6.91	48	\$7.37	47	\$19.21	43	\$24.00	44
South Dakota	\$14.92	23	\$10.37	37	\$17.42	45	\$25.92	42

\*Updated to include Puerto Rico and District of Columbia

For NSF, all states with GPN members are below the national *per capita* average for both 2002 and 2005. Three states (Missouri, North Dakota and South Dakota) declined in *per capita* funding from NSF and also rank lower in 2005 than in 2002. Since US total funding from NSF increased, but funding for research in the states with GPN members decreased, on a *per capita* basis, GPN states went from *59% of the US per capita average in 2002 to 50% in 2005*.

Although the total funding from NIH increased for 2005 over 2002, funding for states with GPN members nonetheless dropped from *66% to 60%, on a per capita basis*. North Dakota and South Dakota improved their *per capita* rankings from 2002 to 2005 while the remaining states ranked lower in 2005. As might be expected from the decrease in NIH funding for the state, Kansas dropped 8 places in the NIH per capita rankings.

### 3.2.2 GPN vs. US: PER GRADUATE FUNDING

Another way to adjust total award data is in terms of numbers of graduates students in relevant disciplines. Award data adjusted for number of graduate students in science (GSS) and graduate students in engineering (GSE) are presented in the Appendix and summarized in Table 5 for states with GPN members.

State	Graduate Students in Science				Graduate Students in Engineering			
	NSF	Rank	NIH	Rank	NSF	Rank	NIH	Rank
<b>GPN</b>	<b>\$8,396</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$44,568</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$25,474</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$135,230</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>US</b>	<b>\$14,716</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$65,565</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$41,940</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$186,861</b>	<b>NA</b>
Arkansas	\$5,059	51	\$33,615	37	\$17,327	48	\$115,135	30
Kansas	\$7,899	44	\$16,832	47	\$24,257	41	\$51,685	48
Missouri	\$9,332	38	\$94,013	8	\$28,745	34	\$289,594	12
Nebraska	\$8,432	40	\$31,353	39	\$51,684	19	\$192,168	19
North Dakota	\$9,460	37	\$19,186	46	\$24,348	40	\$49,381	49
Oklahoma	\$8,367	41	\$27,252	42	\$18,793	47	\$61,212	44
South Dakota	\$11,678	31	\$29,206	40	\$24,223	42	\$60,582	45

States with GPN members are below the national average for per graduate student in science and per graduate student in engineering funding, with the exception of Missouri and NIH. The 2005 *per graduate student in science* funding for the GPN region stood at *61%* of the US average *from NSF* and *68%* of the US average *from NIH*. *Per graduate student in engineering* funding for the GPN region was *61%* of the US average *from NSF* and *72%* of the US average *for NIH*.

### 3.3 Predicting Awards and Funding Amounts

I examined both population and graduate student census as possible predictors of funding. Graduate student in science (GSS) enrollment and graduate student in engineering (GSE) enrollment for GPN states as a percent of total US enrollment are slightly lower than might be anticipated based on population. Both GSS and GSE are highly and significantly correlated with population (Table 6, comparisons 1 & 2). GSS enrollment and GSE enrollment are also highly and significantly correlated (Table 6, comparison 3).

Population, GSS and GSE significantly predicted number of awards and total funding for both NSF and NIH. The correlations between GSS and award data and GSE and award data are consistently higher than those between population and award data. An analysis of the correlation coefficients indicated that, *in all but one case*, the *GSS data* was a *significantly better predictor of number of awards and total dollars awarded* for both the NSF and NIH data *than either population or GSE*. The correlation between GSS and NSF Funding in Dollars (Table 6, comparison 7) was slightly greater than that between GSE and NSF Funding in Dollars (Table 6, comparison 10), but not significantly greater.

Conventional wisdom has it that graduate student funding is less expensive in less populous states because of a lower cost of living. I looked to find evidence of this in a correlation between average award size and either population or one of the enrollment factors. Neither population nor either graduate student variable appears to be a good predictor of average award amount. Perhaps average award amount is

less sensitive to cost of living than another variable such as maximum or minimum award amount for each state.

<b>Table 6. Correlations Among Selected Pairs of Variables for 2005 Award Data</b>		
<b>Comparisons</b>	<b>r</b>	<b>p</b>
1. Population and number of Graduate Students in Science (GSS)	0.946	< .001
2. Population and number of Graduate Students in Engineering (GSE)	0.963	< .001
3. GSS and GSE	0.943	< .001
<b>National Science Foundation</b>		
4. Population and NSF Funding \$	0.804	< .001
5. Population and Number of NSF Awards	0.891	< .001
6. Population and NSF Average Award Amount	-0.013	NS
7. GSS and NSF Funding \$	0.889	< .001
8. GSS and Number of NSF Awards	0.962	< .001
9. GSS and NSF Average Award Amount	0.031	NS
10. GSE and NSF Funding \$	0.860	< .001
11. GSE and Number of NSF Awards	0.922	< .001
12. GSE and NSF Average Award Amount	0.013	NS
<b>National Institutes of Health</b>		
13. Population and NIH Funding \$	0.795	< .001
14. Population and Number of NIH Awards	0.835	< .001
15. Population and NIH Average Award Amount	0.167	NS
16. GSS and NIH Funding \$	0.888	< .001
17. GSS and Number of NIH Awards	0.923	< .001
18. GSS and NIH Average Award Amount	-0.140	NS
19. GSE and NIH Funding \$	0.832	< .001
20. GSE and Number of NIH Awards	0.870	< .001
21. GSE and NIH Average Award Amount	-0.184	NS

#### 4 Conclusion

NSF and NIH each awarded more dollars in 2005 than in 2002. When broken down by top 26 and bottom 26 performers for 2002, the top NSF performers did slightly better in 2005 (15% increase) than did the bottom performers (12% increase) For NIH the bottom NIH performers did slightly better in 2005 (24% increase) than the top performers (22% increase). Nonetheless, the top 26 performers received the lion's share (90%) of the total dollars awarded from each agency.

States with GPN members did not fare as well. In 2005 these states showed an aggregate decrease of roughly 2.2% from NSF and an aggregate increase of 10.8% from NIH over competitive dollars awarded in 2002. In both cases, dollars awarded to the GPN region lagged behind dollars awarded to even the 2002 bottom half performers.

When demographic data (population, graduate enrollment) are used to roughly equate states on dollars awarded, states with GPN members still fall well behind the US average, with the exception of Missouri and 2005 NIH award dollars.

In terms of predictors of funding, graduate student in science (GSS) enrollment emerged as a consistently better predictor of total funding and number of awards than population or graduate student in engineering (GSE) enrollment.

As Dennis Brewer concluded in his earlier analysis, "Just raising our funding to the national average would bring over \$100M per year in new NSF funding into the Great Plains. Like our pioneer forebears, we are blessed with possibilities." That is still the case for 2005.

## 5 References

- [1] Brewer, Dennis. GPN Regional Funding Analysis, *GPN Digest*, Volume 4, Number 2, October, 2003: <http://www.greatplains.net/research/digests/10-22-03.htm>.
- [2] National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Statistics, *Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering: Fall 2004*, NSF 06-325, Project Officer, Julia D. Oliver (Arlington, VA 2006).
- [3] National Center for Educational Statistics, <http://nces.ed.gov>
- [4] US Bureau of Census, <http://www.census.gov>
- [5] National Science Foundation, <http://dellweb.bfa.nsf.gov/>
- [6] National Institutes of Health Award Statistics, <http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/award/trends/states05.htm>
- [7] <http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v50/i05/05a01801.htm>

## **6 Appendices**

## Appendix I

### US Population and Graduate Students in Science and Engineering by State

State (includes DC & Puerto Rico)	Population (2000) <sup>1</sup>	Rank	Graduate Students in Science (2004) <sup>2</sup>	Rank	Graduate Students in Engineering (2004) <sup>2</sup>	Rank
<b>GPN</b>	<b>17,515,990</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>19,067</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>6,284</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>US Total</b>	<b>285,230,516</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>352,548</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>123,701</b>	<b>NA</b>
Alabama	4,447,100	23	4,109	27	1,983	19
Alaska	626,932	49	659	50	155	49
Arizona	5,130,632	20	4,834	24	2,125	18
Arkansas	2,673,400	34	1,853	38	541	37
California	33,871,648	1	47,253	1	16,849	1
Colorado	4,301,261	24	6,988	15	2,917	13
Connecticut	3,405,565	30	5,840	20	1,250	30
Delaware	783,600	46	1,224	45	466	40
District of Columbia	572,059	51	6,830	16	1,698	22
Florida	15,982,378	4	13,362	7	5,770	7
Georgia	8,186,453	10	6,787	17	3,815	10
Hawaii	1,211,537	43	1,680	39	207	47
Idaho	1,293,953	40	1,397	43	544	36
Illinois	12,419,293	5	18,193	4	4,918	9
Indiana	6,080,485	14	6,598	18	2,575	16
Iowa	2,926,324	31	3,885	28	1,310	29
Kansas	2,688,418	33	4,560	26	1,485	26
Kentucky	4,041,769	25	3,507	29	963	33
Louisiana	4,468,976	22	4,995	22	1,678	24
Maine	1,274,923	41	553	51	127	50
Maryland	5,296,486	19	8,466	12	2,583	15
Massachusetts	6,349,097	13	16,347	5	6,084	4
Michigan	9,938,444	8	9,973	9	5,953	5
Minnesota	4,919,479	21	7,234	14	1,685	23
Mississippi	2,844,658	32	2,472	35	514	38
Missouri	5,595,211	17	5,443	21	1,767	21
Montana	902,195	45	1,261	44	195	48
Nebraska	1,711,263	39	2,421	36	395	42
Nevada	1,998,257	36	1,464	42	479	39
New Hampshire	1,235,786	42	1,116	46	318	45
New Jersey	8,414,350	9	8,368	13	3,758	11
New Mexico	1,819,046	37	2,746	34	1,065	32
New York	18,976,457	3	34,589	2	7,036	3
North Carolina	8,049,313	11	9,245	10	2,618	14
North Dakota	642,200	48	1,081	47	420	41
Ohio	11,353,140	7	12,528	8	5,909	6
Oklahoma	3,450,654	28	3,039	31	1,353	28
Oregon	3,421,399	29	3,151	30	937	34
Pennsylvania	12,281,054	6	15,997	6	5,055	8
Puerto Rico	3,808,610	27	3,021	32	356	43
Rhode Island	1,048,319	44	1,679	40	272	46
South Carolina	4,012,012	26	2,162	37	1,247	31
South Dakota	754,844	47	670	49	323	44
Tennessee	5,689,283	16	4,607	25	1,819	20
Texas	20,851,820	2	22,376	3	10,261	2
Utah	2,233,169	35	2,983	33	1,455	27
Vermont	608,827	50	519	52	96	52
Virginia	7,078,515	12	8,828	11	3,720	12
Washington	5,894,121	15	4,979	23	1,503	25
West Virginia	1,808,344	38	1,497	41	793	35
Wisconsin	5,363,675	18	6,441	19	2,241	17
Wyoming	493,782	52	738	48	115	51

<sup>1</sup> Source, US Bureau of Census, <http://www.census.gov>

<sup>2</sup> Source, National Science Foundation, <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/nsf06325/>

## Appendix II FY2005 NSF Funding by State

State (includes DC & Puerto Rico)	NSF Funding 2005 (\$K) <sup>1</sup>	Rank	Number of Awards	Rank	Average Award	Rank
<b>GPN</b>	<b>\$160,079</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>804</b>		<b>\$199,103</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>US Total</b>	<b>\$5,188,020</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>20,346</b>		<b>\$254,990</b>	<b>NA</b>
Alabama	\$31,596	35	146	34	\$216,411	28
Alaska	\$31,852	34	102	39	\$312,275	7
Arizona	\$138,721	12	492	16	\$281,953	10
Arkansas	\$9,374	50	65	44	\$144,215	52
California	\$797,694	1	2,765	1	\$288,497	9
Colorado	\$228,455	5	517	14	\$441,886	4
Connecticut	\$45,415	26	267	24	\$170,094	49
Delaware	\$19,342	43	104	38	\$185,981	41
District of Columbia	\$188,097	8	352	20	\$534,366	3
Florida	\$134,849	13	568	10	\$237,410	17
Georgia	\$100,123	18	446	18	\$224,491	24
Hawaii	\$32,418	33	148	33	\$219,041	26
Idaho	\$11,156	46	49	47	\$227,673	22
Illinois	\$223,091	6	914	5	\$244,082	14
Indiana	\$97,274	19	469	17	\$207,407	30
Iowa	\$41,093	27	240	25	\$171,221	48
Kansas	\$36,021	31	159	32	\$226,547	23
Kentucky	\$22,861	40	121	37	\$188,934	38
Louisiana	\$36,576	30	200	29	\$182,880	42
Maine	\$17,684	45	91	41	\$194,330	37
Maryland	\$124,627	14	578	9	\$215,618	29
Massachusetts	\$358,209	4	1,393	3	\$257,149	12
Michigan	\$162,488	9	708	7	\$229,503	20
Minnesota	\$65,758	21	319	21	\$206,138	32
Mississippi	\$19,933	42	60	45	\$332,217	6
Missouri	\$50,792	24	282	23	\$180,113	45
Montana	\$27,751	37	102	39	\$272,069	11
Nebraska	\$20,415	41	91	41	\$224,341	25
Nevada	\$18,130	44	78	43	\$232,436	18
New Hampshire	\$25,472	38	141	35	\$180,652	44
New Jersey	\$106,029	17	545	11	\$194,549	36
New Mexico	\$40,441	28	160	31	\$252,756	13
New York	\$373,498	3	1,632	2	\$228,859	21
North Carolina	\$123,046	15	613	8	\$200,728	34
North Dakota	\$10,226	49	42	49	\$243,476	15
Ohio	\$86,393	20	524	13	\$164,872	50
Oklahoma	\$25,427	39	123	36	\$206,724	31
Oregon	\$58,218	22	312	22	\$186,596	39
Pennsylvania	\$214,195	7	1,072	4	\$199,809	35
Puerto Rico	\$31,279	36	41	51	\$762,902	1
Rhode Island	\$32,942	32	205	28	\$160,693	51
South Carolina	\$52,471	23	179	30	\$293,134	8
South Dakota	\$7,824	51	42	49	\$186,286	40
Tennessee	\$46,564	25	215	26	\$216,577	27
Texas	\$153,786	10	885	6	\$173,769	47
Utah	\$37,425	29	209	27	\$179,067	46
Vermont	\$10,406	47	43	48	\$242,000	16
Virginia	\$378,404	2	544	12	\$695,596	2
Washington	\$113,740	16	495	15	\$229,778	19
West Virginia	\$6,006	52	33	52	\$182,000	43
Wisconsin	\$152,125	11	414	19	\$367,452	5
Wyoming	\$10,308	48	51	46	\$202,118	33

<sup>1</sup> Source, National Science Foundation, <http://dellweb.bfa.nsf.gov/>

### Appendix III FY2005 NIH Funding by State

State (includes DC & Puerto Rico)	NIH Funding (2005) <sup>1</sup>	Rank	Award Number	Rank	Average Award	Rank
<b>GPN</b>	\$849,787,481	<b>NA</b>	2,049		\$414,733	<b>NA</b>
<b>US Total</b>	<b>\$23,114,840,621</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>53,769</b>		<b>\$429,892</b>	<b>NA</b>
Alabama	\$297,183,360	21	625	23	\$475,493	14
Alaska	\$15,446,156	50	18	51	\$858,120	1
Arizona	\$175,880,998	28	485	27	\$362,641	45
Arkansas	\$62,288,198	42	161	39	\$386,883	33
California	\$3,301,232,109	1	7,460	1	\$442,524	17
Colorado	\$346,726,075	20	986	19	\$351,649	49
Connecticut	\$458,535,852	13	1,217	12	\$376,776	37
Delaware	\$26,546,178	45	64	45	\$414,784	25
District of Columbia	\$233,968,619	24	540	25	\$433,275	21
Florida	\$372,405,996	19	1,042	15	\$357,395	47
Georgia	\$375,326,716	18	1,007	17	\$372,718	39
Hawaii	\$84,501,498	35	103	41	\$820,403	3
Idaho	\$11,539,956	51	24	50	\$480,832	11
Illinois	\$733,891,956	9	1,972	8	\$372,156	40
Indiana	\$218,946,042	25	622	24	\$352,003	48
Iowa	\$193,024,956	26	516	26	\$374,079	38
Kansas	\$76,752,535	37	209	36	\$367,237	42
Kentucky	\$164,894,937	29	435	29	\$379,069	36
Louisiana	\$185,016,753	27	387	31	\$478,079	12
Maine	\$66,669,082	40	136	40	\$490,214	8
Maryland	\$1,764,278,447	4	2,593	6	\$680,400	5
Massachusetts	\$2,272,775,609	2	5,193	2	\$437,661	19
Michigan	\$564,329,435	11	1,543	11	\$365,735	43
Minnesota	\$441,846,503	15	1,030	16	\$428,977	22
Mississippi	\$36,646,522	44	77	43	\$475,929	13
Missouri	\$511,712,948	12	1,201	13	\$426,072	23
Montana	\$43,236,231	43	93	42	\$464,906	15
Nebraska	\$75,906,282	38	216	35	\$351,418	50
Nevada	\$22,981,338	46	52	47	\$441,949	18
New Hampshire	\$97,934,857	34	242	33	\$404,689	30
New Jersey	\$293,474,934	22	690	22	\$425,326	24
New Mexico	\$114,944,144	33	221	34	\$520,109	6
New York	\$2,020,859,690	3	4,896	3	\$412,757	26
North Carolina	\$1,078,384,691	7	2,209	7	\$488,178	9
North Dakota	\$20,739,876	47	43	48	\$482,323	10
Ohio	\$716,967,092	10	1,844	9	\$388,811	32
Oklahoma	\$82,819,568	36	191	37	\$433,610	20
Oregon	\$275,962,818	23	757	21	\$364,548	44
Pennsylvania	\$1,452,228,510	5	3,585	4	\$405,085	29
Puerto Rico	\$64,360,468	41	76	44	\$846,848	2
Rhode Island	\$132,013,130	31	445	28	\$296,659	52
South Carolina	\$127,866,220	32	364	32	\$351,281	51
South Dakota	\$19,568,074	49	28	49	\$698,860	4
Tennessee	\$434,580,817	16	1,059	14	\$410,369	27
Texas	\$1,149,983,026	6	2,830	5	\$406,354	28
Utah	\$151,570,586	30	422	30	\$359,172	46
Vermont	\$67,002,764	39	175	38	\$382,873	35
Virginia	\$451,991,318	14	981	20	\$460,745	16
Washington	\$812,696,664	8	1,633	10	\$497,671	7
West Virginia	\$20,356,732	48	53	46	\$384,089	34
Wisconsin	\$387,749,026	17	995	18	\$389,698	31
Wyoming	\$6,294,329	52	17	52	\$370,255	41

<sup>1</sup> Source, National Institutes of Health,  
<http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/award/trends/states05.htm>

**Appendix IV**  
**Total & Per Capita Federal Spending by State for 2002-2003 [1]**

State	Population 2000 Census	Pork x\$M (2003) <sup>1</sup>	NSF x\$K (FY02) <sup>2</sup>	NIH x\$K (FY02) <sup>3</sup>	Pork/person		NSF/person		NIH/person	
					\$	rank	\$	rank	\$	rank
<b>GPN States</b>	<b>17,515,990</b>	<b>\$133.80</b>	<b>\$163,710</b>	<b>\$766,851</b>	<b>\$7.64</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$9.35</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$43.78</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>All States</b>	<b>280,849,847</b>	<b>\$1,862.00</b>	<b>\$4,362,628</b>	<b>\$18,626,562</b>	<b>\$6.63</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$15.53</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$66.32</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Alabama	4,447,100	\$87.60	\$25,960	\$261,822	\$19.70	9	\$5.84	49	\$58.87	20
Alaska	626,932	\$16.10	\$27,753	\$9,742	\$25.68	8	\$44.27	3	\$15.54	45
Arizona	5,130,632	\$13.30	\$134,025	\$135,829	\$2.59	46	\$26.12	6	\$26.47	36
<b>Arkansas</b>	<b>2,673,400</b>	<b>\$13.00</b>	<b>\$8,720</b>	<b>\$52,940</b>	<b>\$4.86</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>\$3.26</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>\$19.80</b>	<b>41</b>
California	33,871,648	\$95.40	\$687,791	\$2,904,068	\$2.82	45	\$20.31	10	\$85.74	11
Colorado	4,301,261	\$11.00	\$220,083	\$296,518	\$2.56	47	\$51.17	1	\$68.94	13
Connecticut	3,405,565	\$6.80	\$38,560	\$391,221	\$2.00	49	\$11.32	34	\$114.88	3
Delaware	783,600	\$6.20	\$14,108	\$25,061	\$7.91	21	\$18.00	14	\$31.98	31
Florida	15,982,378	\$130.60	\$121,477	\$290,567	\$8.17	20	\$7.60	43	\$18.18	43
Georgia	8,186,453	\$33.60	\$91,165	\$310,609	\$4.10	37	\$11.14	35	\$37.94	28
Hawaii	1,211,537	\$39.40	\$28,022	\$53,189	\$32.52	6	\$23.13	9	\$43.90	27
Idaho	1,293,953	\$18.30	\$9,051	\$11,798	\$14.14	11	\$6.99	46	\$9.12	49
Illinois	12,419,293	\$57.70	\$208,561	\$571,117	\$4.65	35	\$16.79	19	\$45.99	26
Indiana	6,080,485	\$22.40	\$77,772	\$171,525	\$3.68	39	\$12.79	28	\$28.21	34
Iowa	2,926,324	\$36.10	\$33,366	\$181,620	\$12.34	15	\$11.40	31	\$62.06	18
<b>Kansas</b>	<b>2,688,418</b>	<b>\$13.50</b>	<b>\$26,020</b>	<b>\$77,259</b>	<b>\$5.02</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>\$9.68</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>\$28.74</b>	<b>32</b>
Kentucky	4,041,769	\$31.50	\$31,957	\$111,491	\$7.79	22	\$7.91	41	\$27.58	35
Louisiana	4,468,976	\$45.80	\$31,420	\$117,481	\$10.25	16	\$7.03	45	\$26.29	37
Maine	1,274,923	\$16.50	\$21,869	\$67,913	\$12.94	14	\$17.15	17	\$53.27	21
Maryland	5,296,486	\$25.10	\$131,755	\$1,106,532	\$4.74	34	\$24.88	7	\$208.92	2
Massachusetts	6,349,097	\$35.40	\$315,658	\$1,874,137	\$5.58	26	\$49.72	2	\$295.18	1
Michigan	9,938,444	\$36.10	\$129,483	\$486,365	\$3.63	40	\$13.03	27	\$48.94	24
Minnesota	4,919,479	\$9.50	\$56,639	\$372,358	\$1.93	50	\$11.51	30	\$75.69	12
Mississippi	2,844,658	\$87.90	\$18,415	\$34,810	\$30.90	7	\$6.47	48	\$12.24	47
<b>Missouri</b>	<b>5,595,211</b>	<b>\$32.50</b>	<b>\$63,566</b>	<b>\$481,994</b>	<b>\$5.81</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>\$11.36</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>\$86.14</b>	<b>10</b>
Montana	902,195	\$32.80	\$24,386	\$25,623	\$36.36	5	\$27.03	5	\$28.40	33
<b>Nebraska</b>	<b>1,711,263</b>	<b>\$16.30</b>	<b>\$19,444</b>	<b>\$61,633</b>	<b>\$9.53</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>\$11.36</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>\$36.02</b>	<b>30</b>
Nevada	1,998,257	\$34.50	\$16,643	\$18,567	\$17.27	10	\$8.33	38	\$9.29	48
New Hampshire	1,235,786	\$62.30	\$20,374	\$80,468	\$50.41	1	\$16.49	20	\$65.12	16
New Jersey	8,414,350	\$26.20	\$84,526	\$218,026	\$3.11	43	\$10.05	36	\$25.91	38
New Mexico	1,819,046	\$82.90	\$34,881	\$87,479	\$45.57	3	\$19.18	12	\$48.09	25
New York	18,976,457	\$85.70	\$335,712	\$1,714,512	\$4.52	36	\$17.69	15	\$90.35	9
North Carolina	8,049,313	\$25.20	\$95,193	\$780,680	\$3.13	42	\$11.83	29	\$96.99	8
<b>North Dakota</b>	<b>642,200</b>	<b>\$31.80</b>	<b>\$10,873</b>	<b>\$13,603</b>	<b>\$49.52</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$16.93</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>\$21.18</b>	<b>40</b>
Ohio	11,353,140	\$56.00	\$94,211	\$583,603	\$4.93	29	\$8.30	39	\$51.40	22
<b>Oklahoma</b>	<b>3,450,654</b>	<b>\$16.80</b>	<b>\$23,827</b>	<b>\$66,270</b>	<b>\$4.87</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>\$6.91</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>\$19.20</b>	<b>42</b>
Oregon	3,421,399	\$11.10	\$48,942	\$233,541	\$3.24	41	\$14.30	24	\$68.26	14
Pennsylvania	12,281,054	\$93.30	\$176,191	\$1,240,647	\$7.60	23	\$14.35	23	\$101.02	7
Rhode Island	1,048,319	\$14.10	\$25,536	\$115,154	\$13.45	12	\$24.36	8	\$109.85	5
South Carolina	4,012,012	\$36.90	\$55,660	\$103,810	\$9.20	18	\$13.87	25	\$25.87	39
<b>South Dakota</b>	<b>754,844</b>	<b>\$9.90</b>	<b>\$11,260</b>	<b>\$13,152</b>	<b>\$13.12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>\$14.92</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>\$17.42</b>	<b>44</b>
Tennessee	5,689,283	\$13.20	\$46,353	\$337,535	\$2.32	48	\$8.15	40	\$59.33	19
Texas	20,851,820	\$118.80	\$160,357	\$1,027,704	\$5.70	25	\$7.69	42	\$49.29	23
Utah	2,233,169	\$20.20	\$30,605	\$146,037	\$9.05	19	\$13.70	26	\$65.39	15
Vermont	608,827	\$2.90	\$9,565	\$63,812	\$4.76	33	\$15.71	21	\$104.81	6
Virginia	7,078,515	\$35.80	\$261,960	\$261,950	\$5.06	27	\$37.01	4	\$37.01	29
Washington	5,894,121	\$28.20	\$101,695	\$673,614	\$4.78	32	\$17.25	16	\$114.29	4
West Virginia	1,808,344	\$67.30	\$12,754	\$15,246	\$37.22	4	\$7.05	44	\$8.43	50
Wisconsin	5,363,675	\$16.50	\$98,480	\$338,611	\$3.08	44	\$18.36	13	\$63.13	17
Wyoming	493,782	\$2.00	\$10,004	\$7,318	\$4.05	38	\$20.26	11	\$14.82	46

<sup>1</sup> <http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v50/i05/05a01801.htm>,  
<sup>2</sup> <http://dellweb.bfa.nsf.gov/AwdLst2/default.asp>  
<sup>3</sup> <http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/award/trends/states02.htm>

### Appendix V Changes in Funding between FY2002 and FY2005

State (includes DC & Puerto Rico)	NSF			NIH		
	\$K (FY02)*	\$K (FY05)	Change (\$K)	\$K (FY02)*	\$K (FY05)	Change (\$K)
<b>GPN States</b>	<b>\$163,710</b>	<b>(\$160,079)</b>	<b>(\$3,631)</b>	<b>\$766,851</b>	<b>\$849,787</b>	<b>\$82,936</b>
<b>US Total</b>	<b>\$4,535,655</b>	<b>\$5,188,020</b>	<b>\$652,365</b>	<b>\$18,952,636</b>	<b>\$23,114,841</b>	<b>\$4,162,206</b>
Alabama	\$25,960	\$31,596	\$5,636	\$261,822	\$297,183	\$35,361
Alaska	\$27,753	\$31,852	\$4,099	\$9,742	\$15,446	\$5,704
Arizona	\$134,025	\$138,721	\$4,696	\$135,829	\$175,881	\$40,052
Arkansas	\$8,720	\$9,374	\$654	\$52,940	\$62,288	\$9,348
California	\$687,791	\$797,694	\$109,903	\$2,904,068	\$3,301,232	\$397,164
Colorado	\$220,083	\$228,455	\$8,372	\$296,518	\$346,726	\$50,208
Connecticut	\$38,560	\$45,415	\$6,855	\$391,221	\$458,536	\$67,315
Delaware	\$14,108	\$19,342	\$5,234	\$25,061	\$26,546	\$1,485
District of Columbia	\$150,632	\$188,097	\$37,465	\$65,937	\$233,969	(\$26,169)
Florida	\$121,477	\$134,849	\$13,372	\$290,567	\$372,406	\$81,839
Georgia	\$91,165	\$100,123	\$8,958	\$310,609	\$375,327	\$64,718
Hawaii	\$28,022	\$32,418	\$4,396	\$53,189	\$84,501	\$31,312
Idaho	\$9,051	\$11,156	\$2,105	\$11,798	\$11,540	(\$258)
Illinois	\$208,561	\$223,091	\$14,530	\$571,117	\$733,892	\$162,775
Indiana	\$77,772	\$97,274	\$19,502	\$171,525	\$218,946	\$47,421
Iowa	\$33,366	\$41,093	\$7,727	\$181,620	\$193,025	\$11,405
Kansas	\$26,020	\$36,021	\$10,001	\$77,259	\$76,753	(\$506)
Kentucky	\$31,957	\$22,861	(\$9,096)	\$111,491	\$164,895	\$53,404
Louisiana	\$31,420	\$36,576	\$5,156	\$117,481	\$185,017	\$67,536
Maine	\$21,869	\$17,684	(\$4,185)	\$67,913	\$66,669	(\$1,244)
Maryland	\$131,755	\$124,627	(\$7,128)	\$1,106,532	\$1,764,278	\$657,746
Massachusetts	\$315,658	\$358,209	\$42,551	\$1,874,137	\$2,272,776	\$398,639
Michigan	\$129,483	\$162,488	\$33,005	\$486,365	\$564,329	\$77,964
Minnesota	\$56,639	\$65,758	\$9,119	\$372,358	\$441,847	\$69,489
Mississippi	\$18,415	\$19,933	\$1,518	\$34,810	\$36,647	\$1,837
Missouri	\$63,566	\$50,792	(\$12,774)	\$481,994	\$511,713	\$29,719
Montana	\$24,386	\$27,751	\$3,365	\$25,623	\$43,236	\$17,613
Nebraska	\$19,444	\$20,415	\$971	\$61,633	\$75,906	\$14,273
Nevada	\$16,643	\$18,130	\$1,487	\$18,567	\$22,981	\$4,414
New Hampshire	\$20,374	\$25,472	\$5,098	\$80,468	\$97,935	\$17,467
New Jersey	\$84,526	\$106,029	\$21,503	\$218,026	\$293,475	\$75,449
New Mexico	\$34,881	\$40,441	\$5,560	\$87,479	\$114,944	\$27,465
New York	\$335,712	\$373,498	\$37,786	\$1,714,512	\$2,020,860	\$306,348
North Carolina	\$95,193	\$123,046	\$27,853	\$780,680	\$1,078,385	\$297,705
North Dakota	\$10,873	\$10,226	(\$647)	\$13,603	\$20,740	\$7,137
Ohio	\$94,211	\$86,393	(\$7,818)	\$583,603	\$716,967	\$133,364
Oklahoma	\$23,827	\$25,427	\$1,600	\$66,270	\$82,820	\$16,550
Oregon	\$48,942	\$58,218	\$9,276	\$233,541	\$275,963	\$42,422
Pennsylvania	\$176,191	\$214,195	\$38,004	\$1,240,647	\$1,452,229	\$211,582
Puerto Rico	\$22,395	\$31,279	\$8,884	\$65,937	\$64,360	(\$1,577)
Rhode Island	\$25,536	\$32,942	\$7,406	\$115,154	\$132,013	\$16,859
South Carolina	\$55,660	\$52,471	(\$3,189)	\$103,810	\$127,866	\$24,056
South Dakota	\$11,260	\$7,824	(\$3,436)	\$13,152	\$19,568	\$6,416
Tennessee	\$46,353	\$46,564	\$211	\$337,535	\$434,581	\$97,046
Texas	\$160,357	\$153,786	(\$6,571)	\$1,027,704	\$1,149,983	\$122,279
Utah	\$30,605	\$37,425	\$6,820	\$146,037	\$151,571	\$5,534
Vermont	\$9,565	\$10,406	\$841	\$63,812	\$67,003	\$3,191
Virginia	\$261,960	\$378,404	\$116,444	\$261,950	\$451,991	\$190,041
Washington	\$101,695	\$113,740	\$12,045	\$673,614	\$812,697	\$139,083
West Virginia	\$12,754	\$6,006	(\$6,748)	\$15,246	\$20,357	\$5,111
Wisconsin	\$98,480	\$152,125	\$53,645	\$338,611	\$387,749	\$49,138
Wyoming	\$10,004	\$10,308	\$304	\$7,318	\$6,294	(\$1,024)

\*This data has been updated to include the District of Columbia & Puerto Rico.

**Appendix VI**  
**NSF Funding on a Per Graduate Student in Science, Engineering and Per**  
**Capita Basis**

State (includes DC & Puerto Rico)	\$ Per Graduate Student (Science) 2005	Rank	\$ Per Graduate Student (Eng) 2005	Rank	\$ Per Capita 2005	Rank	\$ Per Capita 2002*	Rank
<b>GPN</b>	<b>\$8,396</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$25,474</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$9.14</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$9.35</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>US Total</b>	<b>\$14,716</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$41,940</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$18.19</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$15.90</b>	<b>NA</b>
Alabama	\$7,689	46	\$15,933	49	\$7.10	48	\$5.84	51
Alaska	\$48,334	1	\$205,497	1	\$50.81	5	\$44.27	4
Arizona	\$28,697	5	\$65,280	15	\$27.04	9	\$26.12	7
Arkansas	\$5,059	51	\$17,327	48	\$3.51	51	\$3.26	52
California	\$16,881	17	\$47,344	21	\$23.55	12	\$20.31	11
Colorado	\$32,692	3	\$78,318	12	\$53.11	4	\$51.17	2
Connecticut	\$7,777	45	\$36,332	32	\$13.34	32	\$11.32	35
Delaware	\$15,802	19	\$41,506	26	\$24.68	11	\$18.00	15
District of Columbia	\$27,540	6	\$110,776	6	\$328.81	1		1
Florida	\$10,092	36	\$23,371	44	\$8.44	41	\$7.60	44
Georgia	\$14,752	20	\$26,245	37	\$12.23	35	\$11.14	36
Hawaii	\$19,296	15	\$156,609	2	\$26.76	10	\$23.13	10
Idaho	\$7,986	43	\$20,507	46	\$8.62	40	\$6.99	47
Illinois	\$12,262	30	\$45,362	23	\$17.96	19	\$16.79	20
Indiana	\$14,743	21	\$37,776	31	\$16.00	25	\$12.79	29
Iowa	\$10,577	33	\$31,369	33	\$14.04	28	\$11.40	32
Kansas	\$7,899	44	\$24,257	41	\$13.40	30	\$9.68	38
Kentucky	\$6,519	50	\$23,739	43	\$5.66	50	\$7.91	42
Louisiana	\$7,323	47	\$21,797	45	\$8.18	44	\$7.03	46
Maine	\$31,978	4	\$139,244	4	\$13.87	29	\$17.15	18
Maryland	\$14,721	23	\$48,249	20	\$23.53	13	\$24.88	8
Massachusetts	\$21,913	12	\$58,877	17	\$56.42	2	\$49.72	3
Michigan	\$16,293	18	\$27,295	36	\$16.35	24	\$13.03	28
Minnesota	\$9,090	39	\$39,026	27	\$13.37	31	\$11.51	31
Mississippi	\$8,064	42	\$38,780	28	\$7.01	49	\$6.47	49
Missouri	\$9,332	38	\$28,745	34	\$9.08	38	\$11.36	34
Montana	\$22,007	11	\$142,313	3	\$30.76	7	\$27.03	6
Nebraska	\$8,432	40	\$51,684	19	\$11.93	36	\$11.36	33
Nevada	\$12,384	29	\$37,850	30	\$9.07	39	\$8.33	39
New Hampshire	\$22,824	10	\$80,101	11	\$20.61	16	\$16.49	21
New Jersey	\$12,671	27	\$28,214	35	\$12.60	34	\$10.05	37
New Mexico	\$14,727	22	\$37,973	29	\$22.23	14	\$19.18	13
New York	\$10,798	32	\$53,084	18	\$19.68	17	\$17.69	16
North Carolina	\$13,309	26	\$47,000	22	\$15.29	27	\$11.83	30
North Dakota	\$9,460	37	\$24,348	40	\$15.92	26	\$16.93	19
Ohio	\$6,896	48	\$14,621	51	\$7.61	45	\$8.30	40
Oklahoma	\$8,367	41	\$18,793	47	\$7.37	47	\$6.91	48
Oregon	\$18,476	16	\$62,132	16	\$17.02	22	\$14.30	25
Pennsylvania	\$13,390	25	\$42,373	24	\$17.44	20	\$14.35	24
Puerto Rico	\$10,354	34	\$87,862	10	\$8.21	42	\$5.88	50
Rhode Island	\$19,620	14	\$121,110	5	\$31.42	6	\$24.36	9
South Carolina	\$24,270	7	\$42,078	25	\$13.08	33	\$13.87	26
South Dakota	\$11,678	31	\$24,223	42	\$10.37	37	\$14.92	23
Tennessee	\$10,107	35	\$25,599	39	\$8.18	43	\$8.15	41
Texas	\$6,873	49	\$14,987	50	\$7.38	46	\$7.69	43
Utah	\$12,546	28	\$25,722	38	\$16.76	23	\$13.70	27
Vermont	\$20,050	13	\$108,396	7	\$17.09	21	\$15.71	22
Virginia	\$42,864	2	\$101,722	8	\$53.46	3	\$37.01	5
Washington	\$22,844	9	\$75,675	13	\$19.30	18	\$17.25	17
West Virginia	\$4,012	52	\$7,574	52	\$3.32	52	\$7.05	45
Wisconsin	\$23,618	8	\$67,883	14	\$28.36	8	\$18.36	14
Wyoming	\$13,967	24	\$89,635	9	\$20.88	15	\$20.26	12

\*This data has been updated to include the District of Columbia & Puerto Rico.

**Appendix VII**  
**NIH Funding on a Per Graduate Student in Science, Engineering and Per Capita Basis**

State (includes DC & Puerto Rico)	\$ Per Graduate Student (Science) 2005	Rank	\$ Per Graduate Student (Eng) 2005	Rank	\$ Per Capita 2005	Rank	\$ Per Capita 2002*	Rank
<b>GPN</b>	<b>\$44,568</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$135,230</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$48.51</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$43.78</b>	<b>NA</b>
<b>US Total</b>	<b>\$65,565</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$186,861</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$81.04</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>\$66.45</b>	<b>NA</b>
Alabama	\$72,325	14	\$149,866	23	\$66.83	21	\$58.87	21
Alaska	\$23,439	43	\$99,653	36	\$24.64	43	\$15.54	47
Arizona	\$36,384	33	\$82,768	40	\$34.28	37	\$26.47	37
Arkansas	\$33,615	37	\$115,135	30	\$23.30	46	\$19.80	42
California	\$69,863	15	\$195,930	18	\$97.46	11	\$85.74	12
Colorado	\$49,617	28	\$118,864	29	\$80.61	15	\$68.94	14
Connecticut	\$78,516	13	\$366,829	9	134.64	5	\$114.88	4
Delaware	\$21,688	44	\$56,966	46	\$33.88	38	\$31.98	32
District of	\$34,256	36	\$137,791	26	408.99	1	\$454.74	1
Florida	\$27,871	41	\$64,542	43	\$23.30	45	\$18.18	44
Georgia	\$55,301	22	\$98,382	37	\$45.85	31	\$37.94	29
Hawaii	\$50,299	26	\$408,220	7	\$69.75	19	\$43.90	28
Idaho	\$8,261	52	\$21,213	52	\$8.92	52	\$9.12	51
Illinois	\$40,339	31	\$149,226	24	\$59.09	26	\$45.99	27
Indiana	\$33,184	38	\$85,028	39	\$36.01	35	\$28.21	35
Iowa	\$49,685	27	\$147,347	25	\$65.96	22	\$62.06	19
Kansas	\$16,832	47	\$51,685	48	\$28.55	41	\$28.74	33
Kentucky	\$47,019	29	\$171,230	22	\$40.80	34	\$27.58	36
Louisiana	\$37,040	32	\$110,260	32	\$41.40	33	\$26.29	38
Maine	\$120,559	5	\$524,953	4	\$52.29	29	\$53.27	22
Maryland	\$208,396	1	\$683,035	2	333.10	3	\$208.92	3
Massachusetts	\$139,033	3	\$373,566	8	357.97	2	\$295.18	2
Michigan	\$56,586	21	\$94,797	38	\$56.78	27	\$48.94	25
Minnesota	\$61,079	16	\$262,223	15	\$89.82	13	\$75.69	13
Mississippi	\$14,825	49	\$71,297	42	\$12.88	48	\$12.24	49
Missouri	\$94,013	8	\$289,594	12	\$91.46	12	\$86.14	11
Montana	\$34,287	35	\$221,724	17	\$47.92	30	\$28.40	34
Nebraska	\$31,353	39	\$192,168	19	\$44.36	32	\$36.02	31
Nevada	\$15,698	48	\$47,978	50	\$11.50	50	\$9.29	50
New Hampshire	\$87,755	10	\$307,971	10	\$79.25	16	\$65.11	17
New Jersey	\$35,071	34	\$78,093	41	\$34.88	36	\$25.91	39
New Mexico	\$41,859	30	\$107,929	33	\$63.19	24	\$48.09	26
New York	\$58,425	19	\$287,217	14	106.49	10	\$90.35	10
North Carolina	\$116,645	6	\$411,912	6	133.97	6	\$96.99	9
North Dakota	\$19,186	46	\$49,381	49	\$32.30	39	\$21.18	41
Ohio	\$57,229	20	\$121,335	28	\$63.15	25	\$51.40	23
Oklahoma	\$27,252	42	\$61,212	44	\$24.00	44	\$19.21	43
Oregon	\$87,579	11	\$294,517	11	\$80.66	14	\$68.26	15
Pennsylvania	\$90,781	9	\$287,286	13	118.25	8	\$101.02	8
Puerto Rico	\$21,304	45	\$180,788	20	\$16.90	47	\$17.31	46
Rhode Island	\$78,626	12	\$485,342	5	125.93	7	\$109.85	6
South Carolina	\$59,143	18	\$102,539	35	\$31.87	40	\$25.87	40
South Dakota	\$29,206	40	\$60,582	45	\$25.92	42	\$17.42	45
Tennessee	\$94,331	7	\$238,912	16	\$76.39	17	\$59.33	20
Texas	\$51,394	23	\$112,073	31	\$55.15	28	\$49.29	24
Utah	\$50,811	25	\$104,172	34	\$67.87	20	\$65.39	16
Vermont	\$129,100	4	\$697,945	1	110.05	9	\$104.81	7
Virginia	\$51,200	24	\$121,503	27	\$63.85	23	\$37.01	30
Washington	\$163,225	2	\$540,716	3	137.88	4	\$114.29	5
West Virginia	\$13,598	50	\$25,671	51	\$11.26	51	\$8.43	52
Wisconsin	\$60,200	17	\$173,025	21	\$72.29	18	\$63.13	18
Wyoming	\$8,529	51	\$54,733	47	\$12.75	49	\$14.82	48

\*This data has been updated to include the District of Columbia & Puerto Rico.

