

# **Thai Public University System in Transition: Some Issues on Management and Financing\***

Krissanapong Kirtikara  
King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi  
Bangkok 10140, Thailand

---

## **Abstract**

Higher education of Thailand is undergoing profound transformation as a result of the education reform initiated by the 1999 National Education Act. Public universities- 24 in all, traditionally a part of the Thai Civil Services and constrained by bureaucratic mechanisms, will enjoy more autonomy in terms of academic affairs, personnel and financial and budget management. Transformation from public universities under the Civil Services into autonomous public universities is not straightforward, within the universities themselves and with regards to their new relations with other public agencies. Experiences on the transformation are highlighted. The Paper reviews major sources of incomes of public universities, namely, annual government budget allocation, student fees, hospital incomes, incomes from research, development and consultancy works, student loans and overseas loans. The higher education reform calls for replacing direct financing to public universities which has been practiced from the beginning, supply-side financing, into demand-side financing by providing loans to students. In this undertaking, unit costs have to be developed. Preliminary results of the study by the Council of the University Presidents of Thailand on historical expenses, that would form major inputs into unit costs development, are presented.

## **Notes on Higher Education in Thailand**

Most of the Thai higher education institutes are under the purview of the Ministry of University Affairs (MUA) and the Ministry of Education (MEd). In 2000 there are a total of 645 institutions, not including different campuses. 74 institutions are under MUA, 489 under MOE and there are 82 specialized institutions.

Nearly one quarter of the higher education age-group have enrolled in higher education institutes, excluding open universities. However, access to higher education varies markedly between regions, especially with that of Bangkok area. These are due socio-economic disparity between Bangkok and the vicinity with the rest of the country, and concentration of schools and higher education institutes in Bangkok and big cities. The modern economic development, initiated in the early 1960's favoured Bangkok and its surrounding provinces. Creations of growth centers were trend in the 1980's. It was hoped that wealth would diffuse outward from these

---

\* Paper presented at the Thai-UK University Presidents Forum, Bangkok, 17 January 2002.

growth centers. After 4 decades it became apparent that the “trickling down effect” has not worked. Thailand has become a bi-polar country, rich and modern cities v.s. rural area of subsistent economy, like many developing countries.

Thai higher education institutes are traditionally dominated by the public sectors since the end of the Second World War. However, the Thai private sector, as private colleges, has played a very important role in providing higher education during the last 2 decades since the government decoupled the question of national security from higher education. The country has to mobilize resources from the private sector to provide higher education as demand increases due to manpower for modern economic development.

### **Higher Education Reform**

Social movements in the 1990s resulted in the promulgation of the 1997 Constitution. The salient points of the Constitution are transparency and accountability of government, increase of public participation in country governance, and education reform. The organic law of education reform was enacted as the 1999 National Education Act. The rationale for the higher education reform from as follows:

1. Intrinsic problems and crises. Examples are inefficient management structure of public higher education system under the Civil Services, low level of research and development, disparities in quality and access to higher education among different region and weak linkages and interaction between universities and the modern economic sectors.
2. Demand of quality workforce to enhance national competitiveness in world community.
3. Limitation of national resources for education and higher education. Education budget has traditionally been a major part of the Government budget, about 20%, Table 1. The economic contraction after the economic collapse in 1997, makes it difficult to maintain the education budget in real term. The education reform demands that more budget will be required on the 12-year basic education. The share of higher education would be less.
4. Development and impacts of information technology
5. Growing demand for higher education. The 9-year compulsory education and 12-year free basic education as a consequence of the 1999 National Education Act will result in a large increase of high school graduates. The figures are 0.7 million in 2000 to 1.8 million in 2016, an increase of 150 % in 15 years time. Demand for higher education places will increase correspondingly and put severe pressure on the education and higher education systems with intrinsic weaknesses described above.
6. Implications and impacts of the 1999 National Education Act. These are

- restructuring of the higher education administrative system through merging of MEd., MUA and the National Education Commission(NEC), and creation of the Ministry of Education, Religions and Culture (MERC). Public and private higher education institutes at degree granting level (about 150 institutes) will come under the yet-to-be-established National Commission on Higher Education.
- changing of the public sector role in public higher education institutes from regulatory to supervisory, through incorporating public higher education institutes, presently part of the Civil Services, into autonomous agencies or public corporate.
- creation of a national agency on education quality assurance that will set national education standards and undertake systematic implementation of quality assessment.
- extensive resources mobilization and investment in education , and
- redirecting missions of higher education towards societal participation, student-centered learning and lifelong learning.

### **Development of Autonomous Public Universities**

Colonization of neighboring countries of Thailand about 150 years ago necessitated reformation of public management from a feudal based system to a bureaucracy based system of Europe. Professional schools were established to prepare manpower to run the new Thai bureaucracy. Subsequently, the first public university of Thailand under the newly founded Ministry of Education, Chulalongkorn University, was established nearly 80 years ago combining some of these professional schools. This happened nearly at the same time when Thailand changed from an absolute monarchy government to constitution monarchy government in 1932.

Shortcomings of the first public university operating under the Civil Services was recognized even at that time. For a university to function properly academic freedom is a must. This can never happen under a regimentation nature of the Civil Services.

The issue on autonomy of public universities lay dormant for nearly half a century after the founding of the first public university. During the intervening period most governments are non-democratically elected and public universities were led by high ranking serving or ex-military people. This had created strong discontent and disillusion among leading figures in public universities normally educated in European or the US universities after the Second World War. There was a movement to bring the public universities out of the Civil Services, **incorporation of public universities**, in the mid 1960's. The concept of **autonomous university** is thus enshrined. No public universities then were incorporated as governments were yet non-democratically elected.

With the modern economic development of the country starting in early 1960s, it became apparent few decades after, around the early 1980s, that the Thai public universities were weak and lacked dynamism. Universities functioned mainly in producing professionals for the Civil Services and the private sector. Major government planning bodies such as the National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB) and the National Education Commission (NEC) became advocates of incorporating public universities as one means of invigorating universities. National Economic and Social Development Plans and National Education Plans have since called for autonomy of public universities. The First Long Range Plan for Higher Education (1990-2004) stipulated that future public universities to be established must be autonomous universities from the beginning whereas existing public universities should be incorporated within 10 years, i.e. by 2000.

With this foundation, 3 new public universities established in the 1990s became autonomous universities. They are Suranaree University of Technology, Walailak University and Mae Fah Luang University. In 1991, there was an attempt to incorporate 15 public universities but it was not successful as the university people and the public were ignorant of the nature and benefits of autonomous universities. No more attempt has been made. However, with an exception, one public university- King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi (KMUTT) had decided to pursue the incorporation path and became an autonomous university in March 1998. Presently, KMUTT is the only public university that has been transformed from a university under the Civil Services to become an autonomous public university.

### **Lessons Learned from KMUTT Transformation**

The transformation of KMUTT has been closely watched by the remaining universities, in particular, difficulties the University faced in dealing with the bureaucracy on budgets and privileges. The birth of the 3 new autonomous universities occurred during the period of the 1990's economic boom whereas the birth of KMUTT as an autonomous public university was right after the 1997 economic collapse. What KMUTT manages to secure from the bureaucracy will be used as precedents when the remaining 20 public universities become incorporated.

In 1997, the Government made a commitment to the Asian Development Bank (ADB) in securing an education loan for public universities that existing public universities would be incorporated by 2002. Reservations have been made, based on difficulties that KMUTT has faced after its transformation, and become a basis of opposition in becoming autonomous universities.

Major issues that have been debated and resolved in principle are:

#### **1. Funding support from the Government.**

Ignorance that autonomous universities will receive less public funding and must eventually be self financing still persists among university people, the bureaucracy and the

public. It is perceived that autonomous universities would be run like business corporate. Student fees would be increased making university education out of reach of poor students. Academic programs that fail to make money would be terminated and staff dismissed. The Government of Prime Minister Chuan Leekpai, even with a strong intention of university autonomy but burdened with extreme difficulties to tackle economic collapses, failed to deliver a strong message that autonomous universities are still qualified for public funding.

Only in August 2001 that Prime Minister Taksin Shinawatra came out clear on **the issue that autonomous public universities are entitled to public funding.**

Public university people are still insulated from the facts the public funding for higher education would be less owing to various factors. The most important factor is that the **1999 National Education Act commits the country to spending more on basic education**, which is what it should be. On the economic front, the emphasis will be on moderate and more equitable growth. Services of public debts would required 5-10% of annual government budget. In summary, all trends point towards less public funding for higher education. It is imperative that the government would ensure **access to university education by providing adequate student loans** for those who need them.

## **2. Performance evaluation and personnel management.**

Public universities being part of the Civil Services, university personnel are civil servants. This being so, they are immune to rigorous performance evaluation like employees in the private sector and enjoy life-long employment until retirement. Personnel of autonomous universities are regularly evaluated like employee in the private sector and employed on a contract basis. It is feared that performance evaluation system of autonomous universities could be unfair and personnel could be poorly treated and easily dismissed.

Personnel in existing public universities fear that their civil servant status will be involuntarily changed into university employees. Life long employment would be forcibly terminated as their new employment will be on contract basis.

However, Prime Minister Taksin Shinawatra has made clear that transformation of existing personnel is left to be determined by each university on terms and transition period.

KMUTT has adopted a **dual personnel management system**. Existing civil servants are permitted to make their own decision as to when they want to be recruited into the new personnel system as university employees. It is voluntary. Applications must be made and evaluated before university employee status is accorded. There is no automatic transformation of status. Civil servant position vacancies arising from retirement and resignation are abolished. Employee positions are created instead. Newly employed personnel are always employed on contract basis. It is stipulated in the **1998 KMUTT Act** that the period that civil servants of the University can apply to change the employment status into that of university employees will be determined by the University Council. The initial 5 years after transformation (March 1998 -

March 2003) is the promotion period whereby incentives are provided for those civil servants wanting to change their employment status.

The dual personnel management system means that there are 2 types of university people, i.e. civil servants and university employees. The system may be cumbersome as there are 2 sets of personnel management systems to be observed. The system is also sensitive to attrition as 2 types of personnel are working on the same job but with different compensations. The University has recognized that personnel employment status transformation is a critical factor and the system must honor a decision of each individual on when he/she wants to change the employment status. This will bring about peaceful transformation of a university.

At the beginning of 2002, three and a half year after incorporation of KMUTT, half of its personnel are university employee on contract basis. By 5 years it is envisaged that the majority would be university employee.

### **3. Autonomous university governance.**

**Autonomy in management of academic matters, personnel and finance** is the 3 pillars of autonomous universities. University personnel in the Civil Services are apprehensive of autonomy governance. Dependency on bureaucratic rules imported from outside universities has become addictive. Autonomy means increase in responsibility and accountability. Many university personnel have enjoyed freedom without responsibility and accountability in the past.

Good governance will be an important issue in management of autonomous universities. A university council need to be strengthened as they represent the government (MUA or Med.) and the public interest in overall internal management of a university. Most existing university councils carry pro-forma duty. A university council, in a new management context, is supreme in setting the vision and direction of a university, formulating policy on education and research, overseeing the personnel system, budget and finance. Performance evaluation of faculties, functional units as well as senior administrators are to be carried out by a university council. An internal audit unit needs to be similarly strengthened to do internal auditing and performance evaluation, in addition to simply auditing of accounts normally carried out by the National Audit Office. **Reporting, auditing and assessment** will become regular features and are a manifestation of **transparency and accountability** dimensions of good governance.

### **4. Privileges for autonomous public universities and their personnel**

There are three types of public agencies and corresponding personnel, i.e. **the Civil Services** and civil servants, **state enterprises** and their employees and **public organizations** and employees. Public organizations can be created either by the legislative branch through enactment an Act of Parliament or by the executive branch through promulgation of a Royal Decree. An autonomous university is of that of the first nature and enjoys considerable autonomy.

Public universities being part of the Civil Services have been accorded privileges similar to all civil service agencies. Their personnel being civil servants are accorded privileges similar to all civil servants. Difficulties have arisen when a public university that used to be a part of a Civil Services has become a public autonomous university, and when a civil servant has become an autonomous university employee. How much of the original privileges of civil service agencies and of civil servants should be accorded to autonomous universities and employees are still issues of contentions. Many of the bureaucrats have objections to seeing similar privileges in autonomous universities. This poses an additional disincentive in the transformation. Many issues have been resolved by KMUTT ironing out with the bureaucracy during the last 3 years. The government has become more forceful in directing the bureaucracy to remove these disincentives so that public universities would be less objectionable to becoming autonomous universities.

Important issues that have been resolved in principle are:

- utilization of public lands
- continuation of services between a civil service agency and an autonomous university for public scholarship holders
- customs and excise taxes and value-added services taxes
- superannuation scheme
- royal decoration

At the beginning of 2002, progress in transformation of the remaining public universities is as follows:

- 5 universities have submitted their draft acts on the transformation to the Cabinet and under deliberation of the Council of State. The next step would be submission to the Parliament.
- 2 universities have their draft acts forwarded to the Cabinet.
- 1 university has its draft act forwarded to MUA.
- 12 universities have yet to submit their draft acts.

### **Financing of Public Universities**

As far as financing of education is concerned, Tables 1 and 2, Thailand has spent about 20% of her annual budgets on education. On the GDP basis, public education spending amounts to 3-4%. This puts Thailand as a country that spends considerably on education.

However, when this is translated into international competitiveness the outcomes and impacts are rather mixed but this is not the issue to be addressed by this paper.

After the 1997 economic collapse, successive governments managed to maintain at least the same amount, about 200-220 billion bath, of an annual budget on education between 1997-2002. Given annual inflation of 3-5%, this implies that education just manages to maintain its level. However, on the annual budget basis, education fares well above other government spending.

With regards to public universities, the **trend of declining government spending** is clearly observed, Tables 2 and 3. Spending declines when measured in both the quantum of government budget allocated for public universities, and as percentages of annual government budget and GDP. This is a worrying trend when one considers that more school students can be expected owing to the free 12-year basic education. Yet, public universities are under pressure to perform better in addressing 2 overriding issues of the country, i.e. **international competitiveness and poverty alleviation**. It has become a common feature all over the world that public universities are required to do more in time of less public resources.

### **Public University Incomes**

It can be said with certainty that incomes of most public universities are derived from government budget allocated. Public university expenditures on equipment and buildings are obtained mostly from the government budget whereas a large part of operating expenditures are still from the government.

In summary, major income sources are

#### **1. Annual university budget allocated through MUA.**

It is estimated that these represent about three quarters of total university budget. As stated in the aforementioned, this has been declining and is expected to decline further.

#### **2. Student fees**

In most public universities that have no university hospitals student fees are about 20-25% of university incomes. There has been calls for at least 2 decades that public universities increase student fees so that higher education students should shoulder a higher proportion of their education. This is in line with a universal practice plus the fact that most students (over 80%) of public universities in Thailand having limited admission are from families with good socio-economic background and cities while over 60% of the population are in rural Thailand. In short, the public has been subsidizing education of well-to-do students.

The principle of increasing student fees is difficult to put into practice. Public university students have enjoyed low tuition fees since the end of the World War II when Thailand went through rapid expansion of economic development and corresponding expansion of

public higher education. However, levels of public subsidies of higher education institutes vary markedly among types of institutes, universities under MUA are highly subsidized in comparison to higher education institutes under MEd., and among fields of study. The disparities have become quite intractable.

### Student loans

To ensure access to higher education for poor students a national scheme on student loans has been introduced since 1996. At the time of introduction the free basic education was 9 years so students beyond that stage, i.e. the 3-year upper secondary education level and the higher education level, are entitled to student loans. With the promulgation of the 1999 National Education Act the free basic education is 12 years. Table 4 indicates that between 1996 to 1999 the number of secondary school students with student loans were increasing but the figures decline after that due to the free education. At the same time, the number of higher education students with student loans are increasing as more secondary school graduates go to higher education. Overtime the figures of students with loans in higher education will outnumber those of secondary education, the latter will eventually diminish. Up to the year 2000 the national scheme on student loans involves about 0.9 million students and about 84 billion baht.

On the repayment nature of student loans, this is not income-contingent based like that of Australia. Students have few years grace period after graduation and 20 years for repayment. The first repayment occurred over a year ago and the figure was bad. Many factors have yet to be clarified as regard to repayment. These may be due to low level of employment during present economic recession, inadequacy of mechanisms to track graduates under employment and irresponsibility of graduates.

Management of the student loan scheme must be improved so that there will be enough public money to ensure access to higher education for poor students. With student loans the objection to increasing student fees would be less, the argument that higher education is for rich students will be less tenable. A large proportion of student loans will be ploughed into universities as student fees. The amount and proportion of student fees as university incomes would increase.

### **3. University Hospitals**

For the 5 public universities with long established, university hospitals (Chulaongkorn University, Khon Kaen University, Chiang Mai University, Mahidol University and Prince of Songkla University) incomes from the hospitals are substantial and well over student fees. However, a large proportion of hospital earnings are spent within hospital themselves but the remaining net incomes are considerable. Most of the net incomes will be spent on the hospitals and medical science schools.

In 2002 the government of Prime Minister Taksin Shinawatra has installed national health scheme whereby a fixed nominal fee of 30 baht will be levied for each medical visit and requisite medical treatment regarding of the actual expenses. A fixed budget for medical

expenses is allocated for each Thai. The hospitals of the first visit, forming the first tier of public medical services, will be entitled to this budget. Medical expenses of subsequent referral to more specialized hospitals, being the higher tiers, will be reimbursed through hospital of the first visit. It is the fear of specialized hospitals, of which university hospitals are, that their expenses would not be fully recovered. If this is so, incomes of university hospitals will decline and the university hospitals cannot maintain their quality of services.

The issue is very recent. It remains to be seen whether this fear will be borne out and what measures will the government takes.

#### **4. Incomes from research, development, training and consultancy works**

As previously mentioned, research and development in Thai public universities are at a very low and unsatisfactory level. The gross incomes of all public universities in this category are estimated to be much less than that from student fees (5.1 billion baht in 2001). Moreover, net earnings from research and development are small, possibly about 10% of the gross earnings. Most funding sources, public or private, would be inclined to cover only direct expenses. The disincentive is further compounded by the fact that government budget allocation to public universities is mainly for undergraduates. Infrastructures such as libraries and IT facilities are just enough for undergraduates. Research of graduate students and research contracts put extra burdens on these under funded infrastructures. This being so, unless the mindset of funding sources changes there will be no strong incentives for R&D in public universities.

Incomes from consultancy works can be quite substantial if universities can manage consultancy work properly. It has always been a practice that university people undertake consultancy work as individuals. Therefore, incomes are not duly returned to universities.

Training provides some incomes but of less significant proportion. The Education Reform calls for life-long and continuing education. It should change operation modes of universities and could be a major source of income. With the advent of on-line learning and training, one can foresee a very great potential.

#### **5. Other income sources**

Public universities in Europe and the U.S. can derive a major income from public or private endowments and university investments. Such are not available in Thailand. Only one public university-Chulalongkorn University has been endowed by the its founder-King Rama VI. It can draw considerable fund from this source for the university development.

Ten Thai public universities with university schools, 10 universities, have some earning from the schools. However, earnings will be earmarked for school operation and, in some cases, education faculties associating with the schools.

Public university incomes are poorly documented and normally under-reported. It is estimated that the actual figures could be up to 50% more for the category of incomes from research, development, consultancy and other sources.

## **Overseas Grants and Loans for Public Universities**

### Overseas Grants

For nearly 3 decades after the Second World War Thailand, classified as a developing country, was entitled to overseas technical assistance. Significant grants were made to Thai public universities. The major benefactors were Japan and Germany. By the end of 1980's Thailand had become a medium-income developing country and overseas technical assistance had diminished.

### Overseas Loans

Compared to other public sectors, overseas loans to public universities are not significant. Governments and loan sources have had tendency concentrate on physical infrastructure development and projects that require foreign currencies. The last 10 years has witnessed few overseas loans from the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and the OECF/ JBIC for higher education. The Ministry of Education has the World Bank loans for the Rajabhat Institute and the Rajamankala Institute.

For the public universities, there are 3 major on-going overseas loan projects, viz.

- the OECF Project(Y8,596 million, 1995-2005) on technology transfer between Japan and Thailand (Faculty of Sciences and Faculty of Engineering of Chulalongkorn University).
- the World Bank Project(\$247.5 million, 1997-2002) on upgrading science and engineering faculties of public universities.
- the Asian Development Project(\$91.09 million, 1999-2005) for strengthening graduate study and research in science and technology carried out by university consortia.

Large overseas and domestic public debts, moderate growth of economy projected for this decade and fiscal prudence will likely preclude new overseas loans for public universities in the medium term.

## **Higher Education Reform : From Supply to Demand Side Financing**

### Towards Unit Cost Development

Budget allocation from the government, based on the normal line-item budget of the Civil Services agencies, has always been directly made to Thai public universities-supply side financing. It has been observed that rules of allocation have never been made clear. Incremental increase is made on past year allocations with inexplicable rationale.

The Higher Education Reform has called for, inter alias,

- incorporatisation of public universities,
- allocation of block grant budget to autonomous universities with efficient budget management in place, and
- allocation of budget to autonomous universities based on unit costs.

It is envisaged that development of unit costs acceptable to the government and the universities will take place during the 9<sup>th</sup> Economic and Social Development Plan (2002-2006). During the last few years, the Ministry of University Affairs has studied unit cost models of Australia and the U.K. However, the outcomes are not well-received by public universities as it is felt that the studies have paid undue consideration on wide-ranging history, nature and missions of public universities. The studies do not address existing funding disparities, their causes and rectifying measures. They rather propose unit costs that would average out the disparities without attempting to understand the whole system. Moreover, doubts are made on input data to the studies and that the data are expenses not true costs.

#### The Council of University Presidents of Thailand Study on Unit Costs

In 2001 the Council of University Presidents of Thailand (CUPT) had asked its Financing and Resources Forum to study how unit costs should be developed. All 24 public universities take part in the study in terms of providing historical data of their university expenses on a common and agreed upon basis so that data can be confidently compared and analyzed. In essence, historical unit expenses, not unit costs, will come out.

In the study

- historical data of total university operating expenses of 3 fiscal years will be compared. The total expenses consist of the allocated part from the government and that from university derived from student fees and other incomes. It is planned to look at different periods of the economy, that would be reflected in university budget allocations. The 3 years are 1996 (prior to the 1997 economic crisis), 1999 (more or less the worst year after the crisis) and 2001 (when the economy has picked up). So far, partial data of 1996 and complete data of 1999 are available for analysis.
- only the portion of public university students funded by government budget allocation (the so-called regular students) will be included in the study. Most public universities have other groups of students who pay higher tuition fees than regular students, a somewhat partial approach to full-fee paying. The student unit in the calculation is a full time equivalent student (FTES).

- agreements are made among universities on criteria to allocate common indirect expenses, for example, expenses of computer centers, libraries and central offices.
- about 300 schools and faculties in all public universities are grouped into 16 categories and 6 clusters.
- analyses have been made on following parameters on FTES basis: total expenses, direct and indirect expenses, personnel and other operating expenses and self funding ratios.

Preliminary results indicate that

- there exist large variation in unit expenses among the 16 categories under study. For example, in the Engineering Schools categories the average unit expenses is 70,613 baht while the maximum unit expenses is nearly 4 times as much and the minimum is 44,047 baht. The differences in a large part can be explained in terms of maturity of programs and departments.
- in most public universities personnel expenses represent 60-70% of total operating expenses.
- in most public universities 50-60% of the total expenses are direct expenses into teaching.
- in most public universities the annual government budget is about 75% of its total operating expenses.

The Higher Education Reform calls for the development of unit costs within the 9<sup>th</sup> National Economic and Social Development Plan (2002-2006) so that full implementation of unit costs can take place in the 10<sup>th</sup> Plan. It will require considerable effort and transition mechanisms to derive unit costs from such large variations in unit expenses observed without disruption to the public universities. Moreover, the public and private universities, presently under the Ministry of University Affairs, and the other two groups of higher education institutes under the Ministry of Education, the Rajabhat Institutes and the Rajamangkala Institutes, will come under the proposed National Higher Education Commission. Guidelines to fund all public higher education institutes (about 150) under one roof will have to be developed. This requires leadership and finesse.

### **Acknowledgements**

The author wishes to thank the Ministry of University Affairs and the Office of the National Education Commission for providing necessary data for this paper. The assistance of Mr. Surain Thapanangkun in the manuscript preparation is gratefully acknowledged.

**Table 1 Public Education Budget (Classified According to Education Levels) for FY 1992-2002 in Million Baht**

Education Levels	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Kindergarten and Primary Ed.	42,156	53,342	59,564	65,265	78,629	96,175	89,113	90,876	96,089	98,465	97923
Secondary Education	23,516	30,314	35,196	38,248	45,752	55,591	50,312	49,848	51,770	52,460	53805.8
Higher Education	14,906	17,904	20,484	23,485	29,743	37,899	33,986	35,543	34,482	32,762	32008.3
Unclassified Types	2,054	1,885	1,929	2,294	3,211	3,787	2,941	2,930	2,873	3,171	3372.9
Education Services	781	1,745	1,768	2,615	6,068	15,021	20,634	22,541	28,981	28,092	29048.1
Other Types of Education	2,252	2,881	3,032	3,402	4,158	5,825	4,722	5,580	6,426	6,642	6782.3
Total Education Budget	85,664	108,070	121,973	135,309	167,560	214,298	201,708	207,316	220,621	221,592	222,940
Total Government Budget	460,400	560,000	625,000	715,000	843,000	925,000	830,000	825,000	860,000	910,000	1,023,000
GDP	2,839,140	3,170,258	3,630,805	4,188,929	4,622,832	4,740,249	4,628,431	4,615,388	4,900,330	5,086,543	5,290,004
Education/Government Budget	18.61	19.30	19.52	18.92	19.88	23.17	24.30	25.13	25.65	24.35	21.79
Education Budget/GDP	3.02	3.41	3.36	3.23	3.62	4.52	4.36	4.49	4.50	4.36	4.21
Basic Education/GDP	2.31	2.64	2.61	2.47	2.69	3.20	3.01	3.05	3.02	2.97	2.87

Source: Consolidated Government Budget (The Budget Bureau)

**Table 2 Percentages of Public Education Budget for FY 1992-2002**

Education Levels	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Kindergarten and Primary Ed.	49.2	49.4	48.8	48.2	46.9	44.9	44.2	43.8	43.6	44.4	43.9
Secondary Education	27.5	28.1	28.9	28.3	27.3	25.9	24.9	24.0	23.5	23.7	24.1
Higher Education	17.4	16.6	16.8	17.4	17.8	17.7	16.8	17.1	15.6	14.8	14.4
Unclassified Types	2.4	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.5
Education Services	0.9	1.6	1.4	1.9	3.6	7.0	10.2	10.9	13.1	12.7	13.0
Other Types of Education	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Source: From Table 1

**Table 3 Public University Incomes in Million Baht**

Sources of Income	1998	1999	2000	2001
Government Budget	35,690	33,223	33,852	32,278
University Incomes	12,898	12,867	15,274	15,773
Student Fees	5,485	4,409	4,553	5,183
Hospital Incomes	5,830	6,816	7,972	7,470
Others	1,583	1,642	2,769	2,720

Source: Ministry of University Affairs

**Table 4 Student Loans**

Source: Ministry of University Affairs

**4.1 Ministry of Education Student Loans 1996-2000 in Million Baht**

Education Year	Secondary Education		Higher Education	
	Amount	Number	Amount	Number
2539	2,246.89	115,130	381.84	12,651
2540	6,369.11	324,578	1,592.88	46,782
2541	10,230.08	558,619	2,608.29	77,461
2542	11,521.92	631,202	3,317.78	100,291
2543	10,434.30	608,762	3,875.86	121,501

**4.2 Ministry of University Affairs Student Loans 1996-2000 in Million Baht**

Education Year	Secondary Education		Higher Education	
	Amount	Number	Amount	Number
2539	13.62	284	1,010.27	20,379
2540	63.03	1,020	4,126.20	63,046
2541	26.97	585	6,577.92	110,345
2542	25.52	565	8,881.09	149,810
2543	31.38	588	10,104.34	169,847

**4.3 Consolidated Student Loans 1996-2000 in Million Baht**

Education Year	Secondary Education		Higher Education	
	Amount	Number	Amount	Number
2539	2,260.51	115,414	1,392.11	33,030
2540	6,432.14	325,598	5,719.08	109,828
2541	10,257.05	559,204	9,186.21	187,806
2542	11,547.44	631,767	12,198.87	250,101
2543	10,465.68	609,350	13,980.20	291,348