

**COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE**



SUPPLEMENTAL REQUESTS FOR FY 2008-09

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

**JBC Working Document - Subject to Change
Staff Recommendation Does Not Represent Committee Decision**

**Prepared By:
Eric Kurtz, JBC Staff
January 22, 2009**

For Further Information Contact:

Joint Budget Committee Staff
200 E. 14th Avenue, 3rd Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: (303) 866-2061
TDD: (303) 866-3472

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Narrative Page	Numbers Page
Prioritized Supplementals in Department-Assigned Order		
Supplemental #1 - Tuition and Fee Spending Authority	1	14
Supplemental #2 - Higher Education General Fund Reduction	4	17
Supplemental #3 - Hiring Freeze Reduction	8	23
Totals for All Supplementals	N.A.	25
 Previously Approved FY 2007-08 Interim Supplementals		
Auraria Higher Education Center, Auxiliary Revenue	10	25
College Opportunity Fund Allocation Adjustment	11	25
Totals for All Supplementals	N.A.	26
 Summary of Supplemental #2 by Governing Board	 N.A.	 27

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
 FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
 JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

Prioritized Supplementals

**Supplemental Request, Department Priority #1
 Tuition and Fee Spending Authority**

	Request	Recommendation
Total	<u>\$12,131,339</u>	<u>\$11,892,624</u>
General Fund	0	(238,715)
Cash Funds	12,131,339	12,131,339

Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? [An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforeseen contingency.]	YES
JBC staff and the Department agree that this request is the result of <i>data that was not available when the original appropriation was made</i> . Specifically, the Department has new forecasts of tuition and fee revenues.	

Department Request: The Department requests the following supplemental increases in tuition and fee authority:

	FY 2008-09 Appropriation	Requested Supplemental Increase	Percent Difference
Mesa State College - Tuition	\$25,043,804	\$721,765	2.9%
Colorado State University System - Fees	\$5,015,000	\$7,062,000	140.8%
Fort Lewis College - Tuition	\$24,746,531	\$163,923	0.7%
Colorado School of Mines	<u>\$55,539,258</u>	<u>\$4,183,651</u>	7.5%
- Tuition	\$55,389,258	\$3,288,501	5.9%
- Fees	\$150,000	\$895,150	596.8%

The requested increases in tuition and fee authority are attributable to the following:

- Nonresident tuition rate increases** - The footnotes in the FY 2008-09 Long Bill that established the allowable tuition rate increases for the governing boards included the following language regarding nonresident tuition rates:

It is the intent of the General Assembly that the institutions may increase all graduate and nonresident tuition rates to reflect market conditions and that

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

any additional spending authority necessary to cover graduate and nonresident tuition rate increases will be addressed through a supplemental appropriation during the 2009 legislative session. The General Assembly will not back-fill for graduate and nonresident tuition revenue lost if a graduate or nonresident tuition increase results in a net reduction in graduate or nonresident tuition revenue.

The spending authority for nonresident tuition assumed a five percent increase in nonresident tuition. However, using the flexibility permitted by the footnote, the **Colorado School of Mines** and **Fort Lewis College** both implemented a 9.5 percent increase in nonresident tuition. In addition, nonresident enrollment at the Colorado School of Mines is significantly higher than the forecast used for the appropriation.

2. **Tuition premium** - Footnote 20a of the FY 2008-09 Long Bill authorized the following:

It is the intent of the General Assembly to allow spending authority for institutions that raise funds through the payment of one tuition premium or fees up to a maximum of \$5.00 per credit hour, if approved by a majority of those voting in an election of the entire student body, to be used for faculty retention, faculty compensation, or construction of facilities.

The appropriated spending authority for the governing boards did not include an amount for a tuition or fee premium. It was not known if any governing boards would implement a premium, how much a premium would raise, or whether it would be structured as a fee or tuition increase. **Mesa State College** implemented the allowable tuition premium. It was approved by 79 percent of the students voting in a Spring 2008 student referendum.

3. **Omissions in estimating academic fees** - Governing boards have made frequent errors in reporting academic fees over the last few years. Out of concern that the General Assembly's fee policies are not uniformly interpreted, implemented, and enforced, the JBC requested an audit of both the accuracy of reporting and the effectiveness of legislative controls on fees. In response to the request for an audit, CCHE reviewed existing fee policies and made several clarifications of definitions. Following CCHE's fee policy review, the **Colorado School of Mines** and **Colorado State University System** determined that some capital fees charged to finance construction and maintenance of academic buildings had not been reported to the General Assembly and the institutions required an appropriation of spending authority for these fees.

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

Staff Analysis: Staff recommends the requested increases in tuition and fee spending authority. The tuition increases were authorized in footnotes to the Long Bill. The fees are currently in place and the institutions have already collected the money from students for the Fall and Spring semesters of this fiscal year.

However, staff recommends that the JBC reduce General Fund for the Colorado School of Mines and Colorado State University System. Staff acknowledges that for some fees it may be difficult to distinguish whether the fees require an appropriation or not. For some fees, the General Assembly and CCHE may not have provided sufficient guidance to the institutions. But, the name of the line item that provides spending authority for fees is, "Academic and Academic Facility Fees." Staff can not imagine an interpretation of the meaning of this line item that would not include a fee charged to the students to pay for the construction of academic facilities. Staff believes any budget or policy staff at the institutions that examined these academic facility fees would have to conclude that they require an appropriation. Since the institutions did not request spending authority when the fees were implemented, staff can only assume that either the institutions were deliberately disregarding the limitations on fees set forth by the General Assembly, or the institutions were negligent.

It is too late to require a refund to the students, because many of the students who paid the fees are gone from the institutions. The General Assembly could reduce the General Fund for the institutions by an amount equal to the fee revenue, so that the institutions do not benefit from policies that skirted legislative limits. The General Fund could be appropriated to financial aid as a proxy for a refund. However, eliminating that much General Fund might require the institutions to reduce program expenditures in a way that would hurt students or professors who had nothing to do with the institutional budget procedures that caused the violation of legislative limits on fees.

Instead, staff recommends a smaller, symbolic General Fund reduction for the two institutions as a penalty for failure to comply with legislative policies, similar to a fine for contempt of court. Staff proposes a General Fund reduction equal to three percent of the projected revenue from the unauthorized fees, to be used to address the FY 2008-09 budget deficit. A three percent fine would generate the following:

Institution	Amount
Colorado State University System	\$211,860
Colorado School of Mines	\$26,855
TOTAL	\$238,715

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
 FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
 JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

**Supplemental Request, Department Priority #2
 Higher Education General Fund Reduction**

	Request	Recommendation
Total	(\$58,968,778)	(\$75,193,394)
General Fund	(30,000,000)	(38,154,706)
Cash Funds	(28,968,778)	(37,038,688)

Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? [An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforeseen contingency.]	YES
JBC staff and the Department agree that this request is the result of <i>an unforeseen contingency</i> . Specifically, a new General Fund forecast indicates significantly less General Fund available statewide than the basis for the original appropriation.	

Department Request: The Department proposes reducing General Fund appropriations for fee-for-service contracts with the governing boards, and for grants to local district junior colleges and area vocational schools, by a total of \$30.0 million. The request includes a corresponding reduction in reappropriated funds for the governing boards from the fee-for-service contracts.

OSPB's oral presentation to the JBC noted that the proposed reduction is a little less than half of the new General Fund appropriated to the Department in FY 2008-09 (\$65.2 million). A chart in the written request illustrates that with the proposed reduction the total General Fund appropriations for the Department of Higher Education (not adjusted for enrollment or inflation) would still exceed the FY 2000-01 high point for General Fund appropriations. No further explanation was provided for how the Governor or the Department arrived at the specific requested amount for reduction.

The proposed reduction would be allocated to the governing boards, local district junior colleges, and area vocational schools in proportion to the General Fund increases provided in FY 2008-09. Financial aid programs, where almost all of the money has already been granted to students, would not be reduced. For ease of administration, the Department requests that the reductions be applied to the fee-for-service contracts with the higher education institutions rather than the stipends.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends General Fund reductions totaling \$38.0 million, and a somewhat different method of allocating the reductions by governing board. While the Governor's proposal would reduce total General Fund for the governing boards by 4.7 percent, the proposed reduction is only 1.6 percent of the total funds, including tuition, that are appropriated to the

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

governing boards. Staff believes the institutions are capable of absorbing a larger mid-year reduction.

All institutions maintain operating reserves for contingencies such as lower than expected tuition revenue. The size of operating reserves can vary significantly based on institution-specific policies and whether an institution has recently had to dip into reserves. In addition to operating reserves, institutions typically hold capital reserves for auxiliary facilities. Since auxiliary facilities are expected to be self-funded, institutions must ensure that auxiliary charges for things like meal plans, housing, student government, and parking permits are sufficient to fund facility maintenance as well as operating expenses. Using auxiliary reserves for the academic operating budget rather than auxiliary facility maintenance has negative consequences for the future, and is obviously not normally the best practice, but in a fiscal crisis it is an option available to higher education institutions. A higher education institution transferring money from an auxiliary reserve to the academic operating budget would be analogous to the state transferring cash fund balances to the General Fund. The size of auxiliary reserves varies widely based on institution policies, the number of auxiliaries on the campus, the age and condition of the facilities, etc.

Since at least September there were clear indications to the governing boards that General Fund appropriations might be reduced mid-year, potentially significantly. The Governor implemented a hiring freeze effective October 1. The higher education institutions were exempted from the hiring freeze, but presumably took corresponding measures. For other departments, the Governor's request includes base reductions plus savings associated with the hiring freeze, but for the governing boards in the Department of Higher Education there is only a base reduction. It is not clear from the request if the \$30.0 million reduction for higher education attempts in any way to take into account reductions in expenditures that would already be implemented by the governing boards, if they responded appropriately and in-kind to the announced hiring freeze.

What is a reasonable amount to expect that the higher education institutions either have or should have already reduced from their operating expenditures based on the indications of a General Fund revenue shortfall beginning in September? One way to look at this question is to estimate what the higher education institutions would have saved had they implemented the hiring freeze mandated for other state agencies. The state does not currently ask the higher education institutions to report on staff turnover rates. The Department of Personnel has some data about classified employees, but a footnote to the report warns that the data for higher education is unreliable and incomplete. The statewide turnover ratio for other departments is approximately 12 percent annually. If higher education institutions lose one percent of their workforce per month on the first of the month, then a hiring freeze implemented from October to May (salary savings in June would be attributable to the next fiscal year due to the pay date shift) would have saved roughly \$19.8 million. This is based on information submitted by the Department estimating monthly salaries.

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

Of course, the turnover rate for higher education may be more or less than the statewide annual average. Also, higher education institutions probably don't have steady turnover rates every month, but rather spikes in turnover at the end of semesters. Furthermore, it is unrealistic to expect that every position would be subject to a hiring freeze. Many positions would be exempted. These are just a few of the obvious flaws with this "back of the envelope" calculation. Perhaps between the nuances of higher education hiring practices and the inevitable exemptions, institutions might only have raised a quarter of this amount had they been subject to the hiring freeze. However, the exercise is not about estimating the exact savings from a hiring freeze that was never mandated for higher education institutions. Rather, the exercise is about estimating what institutions have already done, or should have done, if they were reducing expenditures consistent with what was expected of other state agencies. In this context, staff believes it is reasonable to assume that the higher education institutions have a good start on their way to achieving the \$30 million savings proposed by the governor, if they have taken actions to reduce expenditures consistent with the magnitude of a hiring freeze, as staff believes that they should have done.

It is doubtful that higher education institutions went through the machinations of the staff analysis above to determine how much they should scale back expenditures. Rather, staff suspects most have been looking at what happened during the last recession and then deciding what to do based on gut instinct about whether this recession will be shallower or deeper than the last one. During the last recession, bills passed in the 2002 session made mid-year reductions to the FY 2001-02 higher education budget totaling \$14.6 million General Fund. However, these supplemental reductions passed during the session proved to be insufficient and the Governor required the governing boards to revert another \$24.3 million General Fund before the year was out. The next year, during the 2003 session, several bills made mid-year reductions to the FY 2002-03 budget totaling \$112.3 million General Fund. The vast majority of these mid-year reductions came from the governing boards. So, if the institutions are good historians, and if the institutions are expecting this recession to be on par with the last one, then they should be making contingency plans assuming mid-year budget reductions of between \$40 and \$112 million.

The staff recommended General Fund reduction for the governing boards is equal to 2.0 percent of the total appropriated funds -- including tuition, fees, tobacco, and grants -- for each governing board. These sources of revenue are almost completely fungible to the institutions in paying for the academic program. There are a few cases where portions of appropriated fees and grants have restricted uses, but these are not large enough to significantly change the analysis. Staff believes that the Committee needs to consider all sources of revenue that support the academic program, rather than just the General Fund, when determining how much of a reduction in appropriations the governing boards can reasonably implement, and the fair share of reductions for higher education.

Staff recommends a different method for distributing the General Fund reductions because the Department's method would undo the progress of last year's distribution formula toward equalizing

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

the peer gap for each institution. When General Fund was added in FY 2008-09, if one institution was farther from the average peer funding level than another, then that institution received a greater share of the General Fund. The Department's formula for taking away General Fund would result in a larger reduction for that institution, because it received a larger share of the General Fund increase. Making the institutions farthest from their peer average shoulder the largest General Fund reductions seems counter to the principal of equalizing the peer gap.

One solution would be to rerun last year's distribution formula assuming a smaller General Fund increase and then take the difference from what the institutions actually received. However, the peer gap model has multiple steps, the first of which is a base inflationary increase. Running the peer gap model assuming a smaller General Fund increase would have the majority of the money distributed based on inflation. Taking the difference from the actual appropriation would again result in larger General Fund decreases for institutions farthest from their peer average.

To the extent that the peer gap is an indicator of the amount of discretionary spending for an institution, the staff distribution formula will still result in more difficult reductions for the institutions that are farthest from their peers. However, the staff model burdens these institutions less than the Department's formula.

Staff considered targeted base reductions, rather than an across-the-board approach. One logical criteria for targeting reductions would be to focus on institutions with the capacity to backfill General Fund loses with tuition or other revenue. Mid-year tuition increases would be difficult to implement. Developing other sources of revenue such as grants, donations, or local district property taxes takes time. A targeted reduction based on the capacity of institutions to backfill lost General Fund is better implemented at the beginning of a fiscal year.

Another logical criteria for targeting reductions would be to focus on an institution or institutions that will be closed. The staff recommendation assumes that the state is not prepared at this time to close any institutions. Also, closing an institution could require an initial increase in General Fund. Most institutions have financing obligations related to auxiliary facilities. If an institution is closed, the revenue stream to support the annual payments on dormitories, parking structures, student union buildings, and similar buildings would go away. The state might need to pay off the debt and/or find a new use for the facility.

Still another logical criteria would be to target institutions with the largest reserves. The amount of reserves may depend on factors such as size, location, and student demographics that impact the variety and health of auxiliary programs. But, institution reserves are also dependent on governing board policies, and General Fund reductions that target institutions with large reserves may punish institutions with the foresight to save for a rainy day.

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
 FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
 JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

The staff recommendation attempts to spread the pain of mid-year General Fund reductions widely across the governing boards and as equitably as possible. If the JBC identifies criteria for targeted General Fund reductions, staff believes targeted reductions would be better implemented at the beginning of a fiscal year.

All of the above explanation of the staff recommendation focuses on the governing boards, but the Governor's request also includes recommendations for reducing the Local District Junior Colleges and Area Vocational Schools. For these institutions the General Assembly does not set expectations about tuition, local district tax revenue, or school district support. The institutions are most analogous to community colleges. To keep the formula simple, staff assumed that funding for the local district junior colleges and area vocational schools would be reduced by the same percentage as the General Fund reduction for the community colleges.

For the University of Colorado, the JBC staff recommendation would reduce General Fund for the fee-for-service contract. This approach does not require new legislation. However, as noted in the supplemental presentation on tobacco-funded programs, the JBC could instead decide to change the tobacco statutes to reduce funding for CU. Reducing tobacco funding instead of the General Fund would maintain a higher base of appropriations subject to the statutory six percent limit on General Fund. Reducing tobacco funding for CU would only help with the General Fund shortfall if the tobacco savings were then transferred to the General Fund.

**Supplemental Request, Department Priority #3
 Hiring Freeze Reduction**

	Request	Recommendation
Total	(\$112,790)	(\$133,154)
FTE	0.0	(2.1)
General Fund	0	(113,153)
Cash Funds	(15,001)	(20,001)
Reappropriated Funds	(97,789)	0

Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? [An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforeseen contingency.]	YES
JBC staff and the Department agree that this request is the result of <i>an unforeseen contingency</i> . Specifically, a new General Fund forecast indicates significantly less General Fund available statewide than the basis for the original appropriation.	

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
 FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
 JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

Department Request: The request reflects the Department's estimate of the savings associated with the hiring freeze. The hiring freeze did not apply to the governing boards, but it did apply to the Department's administrative staff. The table below summarizes the Department's estimate of the savings by position.

Position Title	Monthly Salary + 20%	Department Estimated Hire Date WITHOUT Hiring Freeze	Months Vacant Due to Freeze	Savings
Capital Asset Coordinator	\$5,802	1-Nov-08	7.0	\$40,614
Staff Assistant	\$4,684	1-Nov-08	7.0	\$32,785
Staff Assistant	\$4,878	1-Jan-09	5.0	\$24,390
Program Specialist	\$5,000	1-Mar-09	3.0	\$15,001

The request includes an assumption that the positions would have remained vacant for a period of time with or without the hiring freeze. The Department requests only the portion of vacancy savings it attributes to the hiring freeze be reduced, presumably because the Department depends on some level of vacancy savings every year to balance its budget. The Department's calculation of the hiring freeze savings for the Department of Higher Education is consistent with the calculation done by other departments.

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommendation is based on one month more of savings than the Department estimated. These are cash funded positions and not subject to the pay date shift. Also, the staff recommendation would apply the amount of indirect cost recoveries saved from the Department's Administration line item toward offsetting General Fund appropriations in the Department of Personnel, resulting in a savings of \$113,153 General Fund. Finally, the staff recommendation reduces 2.1 FTE as well as the dollars from the hiring freeze.

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
 FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
 JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

Previously Approved Interim Supplementals

Supplemental #1 - Auraria Higher Education Center, Auxiliary Revenue

	Request	Recommendation
Total - Cash Funds	(100,000)	(100,000)

<p>Does JBC staff believe the request is consistent with the emergency supplemental criteria outlined in Section 24-75-111, C.R.S.? Pursuant to statute, the Controller may authorize an over expenditure of the existing budget if the over expenditure meets the following criteria: (1) Is approved in whole or in part by the Joint Budget Committee; (2) Is necessary due to unforeseen circumstances arising while the General Assembly is not meeting in regular or special session during which such over expenditure can be legislatively addressed; (3) Is approved by the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (except State, Law, Treasury, Judicial, or Legislative Departments); (4) Is approved by the Capital Development Committee, if a capital request; (5) Is consistent with all statutory provisions applicable to the program, function or purpose for which the over expenditure is made; and (6) Does not exceed the unencumbered balance of the fund from which the over expenditure is made as of the date of the over expenditure.</p>	YES
<p>The request is attributable to a technical error in the appropriation.</p>	

Request: The Department requests eliminating an FY 2007-08 appropriation of \$100,000 cash funds to the Auraria Higher Education Center (AHEC) for auxiliary activities. The request is intended to address a technical error in the appropriation.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the request.

For FY 2007-08 the JBC provided \$100,000 cash funds spending authority to the Auraria Higher Education Center for auxiliary activities. Examples of such auxiliary activities include charges to the constituent institutions of the campus for long distance phone service, postage and shipping, and non-academic space renovations. At other higher education institutions these types of auxiliary activities are not appropriated and decisions about funding are delegated to the governing boards. However, at AHEC the auxiliary activities were appropriated because a statute required the General Assembly to appropriate all cash funds subject to TABOR that are earned by higher education institutions. Unlike the other higher education institutions, AHEC has not been designated an enterprise. Revenue earned by AHEC from its constituent institutions is subject to TABOR and had to be appropriated.

The purpose of the supplemental appropriation was to lift a restriction placed on AHEC's expenditures by the State Controller due to an over-expenditure by AHEC in FY 20067-07. The JBC also sponsored S.B. 08-126 that eliminated the statutory requirement that the General Assembly appropriate all cash funds subject to TABOR that are earned by higher education institutions. The

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
 FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
 JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

thinking was that S.B. 08-126 would eliminate the need for any appropriation to cover auxiliary revenues earned in FY 2007-08 and beyond.

Because S.B. 08-126 did not eliminate the FY 2007-08 appropriation for AHEC's auxiliary activities, the State Controller has interpreted that the General Assembly intends to control AHEC's auxiliary revenues. Staff agrees with the response from the State Controller. Categories of expenditures not appropriated by the General Assembly or otherwise limited by statute would be under the control of the governing board. But, if the General Assembly appropriates a category of expenditures, then it expects the institutions to comply with the appropriation. For example, the General Assembly has chosen to appropriate academic fees. However, staff believes that the General Assembly did not intend to control AHEC's auxiliary revenues and that the failure to eliminate the FY 2007-08 appropriation for AHEC's auxiliary revenues in S.B. 008-126 was a technical error in drafting.

To correct the error, staff recommends sending a letter to the State Controller indicating the JBC's intent to introduce a supplemental bill eliminating the FY 2007-08 appropriation for auxiliary programs, and instructing the State Controller to allow AHEC to over-expend the appropriation until such supplemental can be passed clarifying that the General Assembly did not intend to control the auxiliary activities of AHEC.

Supplemental #2 - College Opportunity Fund Allocation Adjustment

	Request	Recommendation
Stipends - GF	\$2,685,272	\$2,685,272
Fee-for-service Contracts - GF	(\$2,685,272)	(\$2,685,272)
Total	\$0	\$0

The request includes corresponding adjustments in the reappropriated funds spending authority for each governing board that are detailed in a table below.

<p>Does JBC staff believe the request is consistent with the emergency supplemental criteria outlined in Section 24-75-111, C.R.S.? Pursuant to statute, the Controller may authorize an over expenditure of the existing budget if the over expenditure meets the following criteria: (1) Is approved in whole or in part by the Joint Budget Committee; (2) Is necessary due to unforeseen circumstances arising while the General Assembly is not meeting in regular or special session during which such over expenditure can be legislatively addressed; (3) Is approved by the Office of State Planning and Budgeting (except State, Law, Treasury, Judicial, or Legislative Departments); (4) Is approved by the Capital Development Committee, if a capital request; (5) Is consistent with all statutory provisions applicable to the program, function or purpose for which the over expenditure is made; and (6) Does not exceed the unencumbered balance of the fund from which the over expenditure is made as of the date of the over expenditure.</p>	YES
--	------------

New information about the stipend-eligible population is available.

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

Request: The Department requests adjusting the total appropriation for stipends, and the reappropriated funds spending authority for each governing board, based on the stipend-eligible population reflected in the final billings to the College Opportunity Fund for the fiscal year that were submitted on June 15. To offset the increase in expenditures for stipends, the Department proposes reducing the total appropriation for fee-for-service contracts, and the reappropriated funds spending authority for each governing board, by a like amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the request. The Long Bill included a supplemental add-on adjusting the FY 2007-08 stipend spending authority for each governing board to reflect the most recent estimate of the stipend-eligible population at the time. The add-on included a corresponding adjustment in the fee-for-service contract of each governing board to maintain the same total level of funding. Staff assumes that the JBC will want to follow the same principal now that the final billing information is available.

A few institutions earned fewer stipend payments than the appropriation. These institutions will use existing statutes to convert stipend spending authority into a fee-for-service contract. In total, the higher education institutions earned more stipends than the appropriation. If the JBC decides not to increase the stipend spending authority, there will not be enough money in the College Opportunity Fund for all of the stipend payments. Statutes would direct CCHE to reduce the stipend payment per credit hour proportionately to fit the balance in the College Opportunity Fund.

The table on the following page summarizes the changes by governing board. Staff will explore options with the Department over the summer to avoid the need for multiple supplementals on the same topic in future years.

**DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
FY 2008-09 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE**

Stipends and Fee-for-service Contracts			
	FY 2007-08 Appropriation as Adjusted by the Supplemental Add-on	Requested Supplemental Change	New FY 2007-08 Total with Recommendation
Adams	<u>\$13,624,080</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$13,624,080</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	3,713,970	0	3,713,970
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	9,910,110	0	9,910,110
Mesa	<u>\$22,376,340</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$22,376,340</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	11,494,350	206,943	11,701,293
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	10,881,990	(206,943)	10,675,047
Metro	<u>\$44,644,910</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$44,644,910</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	41,379,660	0	41,379,660
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	3,265,250	0	3,265,250
Western	<u>\$11,355,691</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$11,355,691</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	3,738,000	0	3,738,000
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	7,617,691	0	7,617,691
CSU System	<u>\$133,789,929</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$133,789,929</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	50,951,610	169,292	51,120,902
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	82,838,319	(169,292)	82,669,027
Fort Lewis	<u>\$11,653,935</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$11,653,935</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	6,795,150	0	6,795,150
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	4,858,785	0	4,858,785
CU Regents	<u>\$194,986,340</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$194,986,340</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	73,844,190	0	73,844,190
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	121,142,150	0	121,142,150
Mines	<u>\$21,737,271</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$21,737,271</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	7,080,840	0	7,080,840
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	14,656,431	0	14,656,431
UNC	<u>\$41,156,170</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$41,156,170</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	21,771,180	355,106	22,126,286
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	19,384,990	(355,106)	19,029,884
Com. Colleges	<u>\$132,329,692</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$132,329,692</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	106,241,970	1,953,931	108,195,901
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	26,087,722	(1,953,931)	24,133,791
TOTAL	<u>\$627,654,358</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$627,654,358</u>
<i>Stipends</i>	327,010,920	2,685,272	329,696,192
<i>Fee-for-service</i>	300,643,438	(2,685,272)	297,958,166

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION					
Executive Director: David Skaggs					
Supplemental #1 - Tuition and Fee Spending Authority					
<i>(4) College Opportunity Fund Program</i>					
Fee-for-service Contracts - GF	297,958,166	335,557,604	0	(238,715)	335,318,889
<i>(5) Governing Boards</i>					
<i>(B) Trustees of Mesa State College</i>					
FTE	<u>452.2</u>	<u>474.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>474.8</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>22,376,340</u>	<u>24,005,607</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>24,005,607</u>
Student Stipend Payments	11,701,293	12,226,800			12,226,800
Fee-for-service Contracts	10,675,047	11,778,807			11,778,807
Tuition	<u>21,963,026</u>	<u>25,043,804</u>	<u>721,765</u>	<u>721,765</u>	<u>25,765,569</u>
Resident	18,048,806	19,740,816	721,765	721,765	20,462,581
Nonresident	3,914,220	5,302,988	0	0	5,302,988
Academic Fees	411,321	425,000	0	0	425,000
<i>(E) Colorado State University System</i>					
FTE	<u>3,852.4</u>	<u>4,070.7</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4,070.7</u>

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
College Opportunity Fund	<u>133,789,929</u>	<u>146,891,512</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(211,860)</u>	<u>146,679,652</u>
Student Stipend Payments	51,120,902	53,865,172		0	53,865,172
Fee-for-service Contracts	82,669,027	93,026,340		(211,860)	92,814,480
Tuition	<u>183,781,827</u>	<u>205,236,426</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>205,236,426</u>
Resident	96,136,104	109,401,707			109,401,707
Nonresident	87,645,723	95,834,719			95,834,719
Academic Fees	12,080,503	5,015,000	7,062,000	7,062,000	12,077,000
Appropriated Grants - CF	150,000	0	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - RF/CFE	170,000	170,000	0	0	170,000
<i>(F) Trustees of Fort Lewis College</i>	35,398,842	38,530,861	163,923	163,923	38,694,784
FTE	<u>432.3</u>	<u>449.3</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>449.3</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>11,653,935</u>	<u>12,736,330</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12,736,330</u>
Student Stipend Payments	6,775,801	7,087,680			7,087,680
Fee-for-service Contracts	4,878,134	5,648,650			5,648,650
Tuition	<u>22,784,772</u>	<u>24,746,531</u>	<u>163,923</u>	<u>163,923</u>	<u>24,910,454</u>
Resident	7,415,269	8,202,221	0	0	8,202,221
Nonresident	15,369,503	16,544,310	163,923	163,923	16,708,233
Academic Fees	912,135	1,000,000	0	0	1,000,000
Appropriated Grants - RF/CFE	48,000	48,000	0	0	48,000

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
<i>(H) Colorado School of Mines</i>	71,964,514	78,776,644	4,183,651	4,156,796	82,933,440
FTE	<u>629.4</u>	<u>653.6</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>653.6</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>21,737,271</u>	<u>23,237,386</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(26,855)</u>	<u>23,210,531</u>
Student Stipend Payments	7,079,257	7,429,920	0	0	7,429,920
Fee-for-service Contracts	14,658,014	15,807,466		(26,855)	15,780,611
Tuition	<u>49,668,163</u>	<u>55,389,258</u>	<u>3,288,501</u>	<u>3,288,501</u>	<u>58,677,759</u>
Resident	27,232,248	30,431,603	0	0	30,431,603
Nonresident	22,435,915	24,957,655	3,288,501	3,288,501	28,246,156
Academic Fees	559,080	150,000	895,150	895,150	1,045,150
Appropriated Grants - CF	0	0	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - RF/CFE	0	0	0	0	0
Total for Supplemental #1	482,086,302	524,094,854	12,131,339	11,892,624	535,987,478
FTE	<u>5,366.3</u>	<u>5,648.4</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>5,648.4</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>189,557,475</u>	<u>206,870,835</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>(238,715)</u>	<u>206,632,120</u>
Student Stipend Payments	76,677,253	80,609,572	0	0	80,609,572
Fee-for-service Contracts	112,880,222	126,261,263	0	(238,715)	126,022,548
Tuition	<u>278,197,788</u>	<u>310,416,019</u>	<u>4,174,189</u>	<u>4,174,189</u>	<u>314,590,208</u>
Resident	148,832,427	167,776,347	721,765	721,765	168,498,112
Nonresident	129,365,361	142,639,672	3,452,424	3,452,424	146,092,096

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
Tobacco Settlement Distribution	0	0	0	0	0
Academic Fees	13,963,039	6,590,000	7,957,150	7,957,150	14,547,150
Appropriated Grants - CF	150,000	0	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - RF/CFE	218,000	218,000	0	0	218,000
Supplemental #2 - Higher Education General Fund Reduction					
<i>(4) College Opportunity Fund Program</i>					
Fee-for-service Contracts - GF	297,958,166	335,557,604	(28,968,778)	(37,038,688)	298,518,916
<i>(5) Governing Boards</i>					
<i>(A) Trustees of Adams State College</i>					
FTE	<u>271.5</u>	<u>285.3</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>13,624,080</u>	<u>14,608,449</u>	<u>(557,851)</u>	<u>(457,260)</u>	<u>10,345,149</u>
Student Stipend Payments	3,667,925	3,806,040	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	9,956,155	10,802,409	(557,851)	(457,260)	10,345,149
Tuition	<u>7,123,291</u>	<u>7,811,548</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	4,457,230	4,917,565			
Nonresident	2,666,061	2,893,983			
Academic Fees	96,025	443,000	0	0	0

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
<i>(B) Trustees of Mesa State College</i>	44,750,687	49,474,411	(923,321)	(989,488)	10,789,319
FTE	<u>452.2</u>	<u>474.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>22,376,340</u>	<u>24,005,607</u>	<u>(923,321)</u>	<u>(989,488)</u>	<u>10,789,319</u>
Student Stipend Payments	11,701,293	12,226,800	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	10,675,047	11,778,807	(923,321)	(989,488)	10,789,319
Tuition	<u>21,963,026</u>	<u>25,043,804</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	18,048,806	19,740,816			
Nonresident	3,914,220	5,302,988			
Academic Fees	411,321	425,000	0	0	0
<i>(C) Trustees of Metropolitan State College</i>	93,351,476	103,011,292	(2,833,265)	(2,074,661)	3,652,631
FTE	<u>1,056.3</u>	<u>1,124.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>44,644,910</u>	<u>49,713,412</u>	<u>(2,833,265)</u>	<u>(2,074,661)</u>	<u>3,652,631</u>
Student Stipend Payments	40,888,137	43,986,120	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	3,756,773	5,727,292	(2,833,265)	(2,074,661)	3,652,631
Tuition	<u>47,865,187</u>	<u>52,397,880</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	42,780,232	46,627,706			
Nonresident	5,084,955	5,770,174			

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
Academic Fees	841,379	900,000	0	0	0
<i>(D) Trustees of Western State College</i>	19,977,535	21,506,439	(463,186)	(430,129)	7,740,888
FTE	<u>230.9</u>	<u>241.5</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>11,355,691</u>	<u>12,173,017</u>	<u>(463,186)</u>	<u>(430,129)</u>	<u>7,740,888</u>
Student Stipend Payments	3,731,330	4,002,000	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	7,624,361	8,171,017	(463,186)	(430,129)	7,740,888
Tuition	<u>8,621,844</u>	<u>9,307,422</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	4,170,064	4,704,785			
Nonresident	4,451,780	4,602,637			
Academic Fees	0	26,000	0	0	0
<i>(E) Colorado State University System</i>	329,972,259	357,312,938	(7,408,574)	(7,287,499)	85,738,841
FTE	<u>3,852.4</u>	<u>4,070.7</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>133,789,929</u>	<u>146,891,512</u>	<u>(7,408,574)</u>	<u>(7,287,499)</u>	<u>85,738,841</u>
Student Stipend Payments	51,120,902	53,865,172	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	82,669,027	93,026,340	(7,408,574)	(7,287,499)	85,738,841
Tuition	<u>183,781,827</u>	<u>205,236,426</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	96,136,104	109,401,707			
Nonresident	87,645,723	95,834,719			

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
Academic Fees	12,080,503	5,015,000	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - CF	150,000	0	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - RF/CFE	170,000	170,000	0	0	0
<i>(F) Trustees of Fort Lewis College</i>	35,398,842	38,530,861	(613,404)	(773,896)	4,874,754
FTE	<u>432.3</u>	<u>449.3</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>11,653,935</u>	<u>12,736,330</u>	<u>(613,404)</u>	<u>(773,896)</u>	<u>4,874,754</u>
Student Stipend Payments	6,775,801	7,087,680	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	4,878,134	5,648,650	(613,404)	(773,896)	4,874,754
Tuition	<u>22,784,772</u>	<u>24,746,531</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	7,415,269	8,202,221			
Nonresident	15,369,503	16,544,310			
Academic Fees	912,135	1,000,000	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - RF/CFE	48,000	48,000	0	0	0
<i>(G) Regents of the University of Colorado</i>	716,966,486	777,917,970	(7,998,030)	(15,558,359)	116,015,450
FTE	<u>6,441.1</u>	<u>6,507.6</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>194,986,340</u>	<u>209,099,449</u>	<u>(7,998,030)</u>	<u>(15,558,359)</u>	<u>116,015,450</u>
Student Stipend Payments	73,652,240	77,525,640	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	121,334,100	131,573,809	(7,998,030)	(15,558,359)	116,015,450

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
Tobacco Settlement Distribution	8,511,345	18,943,716	0	0	0
Tuition	<u>490,388,093</u>	<u>526,718,894</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	254,141,636	280,026,965			
Nonresident	236,246,457	246,691,929			
Academic Fees	22,423,177	22,498,380	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - RF/CFE	657,531	657,531	0	0	0
<i>(H) Colorado School of Mines</i>	71,964,514	78,776,644	(850,129)	(1,659,206)	14,148,260
FTE	<u>629.4</u>	<u>653.6</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>21,737,271</u>	<u>23,237,386</u>	<u>(850,129)</u>	<u>(1,659,206)</u>	<u>14,148,260</u>
Student Stipend Payments	7,079,257	7,429,920	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	14,658,014	15,807,466	(850,129)	(1,659,206)	14,148,260
Tuition	<u>49,668,163</u>	<u>55,389,258</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	27,232,248	30,431,603			
Nonresident	22,435,915	24,957,655			
Academic Fees	559,080	150,000	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - CF	0	0	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - RF/CFE	0	0	0	0	0
<i>(I) University of Northern Colorado</i>	92,681,279	97,282,524	(1,660,538)	(1,945,650)	20,336,661
FTE	<u>1,015.0</u>	<u>954.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
College Opportunity Fund	<u>41,156,170</u>	<u>44,086,311</u>	<u>(1,660,538)</u>	<u>(1,945,650)</u>	<u>20,336,661</u>
Student Stipend Payments	22,126,286	21,804,000	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	19,029,884	22,282,311	(1,660,538)	(1,945,650)	20,336,661
Tuition	<u>50,733,637</u>	<u>52,398,876</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	37,654,429	38,609,871			
Nonresident	13,079,208	13,789,005			
Academic Fees	791,472	797,337	0	0	0
<i>(J) State Board for the Community Colleges and Occupational Education</i>					
State System Community Colleges	268,206,594	293,127,019	(5,660,480)	(5,862,540)	24,876,963
FTE	<u>4,576.4</u>	<u>4,720.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
College Opportunity Fund	<u>132,329,692</u>	<u>142,320,783</u>	<u>(5,660,480)</u>	<u>(5,862,540)</u>	<u>24,876,963</u>
Student Stipend Payments	108,195,901	111,581,280	0	0	0
Fee-for-service Contracts	24,133,791	30,739,503	(5,660,480)	(5,862,540)	24,876,963
Tuition	<u>131,613,363</u>	<u>143,460,496</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Resident	108,724,465	117,856,313			
Nonresident	22,888,898	25,604,183			
Academic Fees	4,263,539	5,845,740	0	0	0
Appropriated Grants - RF/CFE	0	1,500,000	0	0	0

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
<i>(6) Local District Junior College Grants</i>					
General Fund	14,823,001	15,890,257	(604,824)	(654,558)	15,235,699
<i>(8) Division of Occupational Education</i>					
<i>(C) Area Vocational School Support</i>					
General Fund	10,450,136	11,202,546	(426,398)	(461,460)	10,741,086
Total for Supplemental #2	<u>2,017,344,371</u>	<u>2,202,453,502</u>	<u>(58,968,778)</u>	<u>(75,193,394)</u>	<u>2,127,260,108</u>
General Fund	323,231,303	362,650,407	(30,000,000)	(38,154,706)	324,495,701
Reappropriated Funds	1,694,113,068	1,839,803,095	(28,968,778)	(37,038,688)	1,802,764,407
Supplemental #3 - Hiring Freeze Reduction					
<i>(2) Colorado Commission on Higher Education</i>					
(A) Administration	2,390,137	2,706,248	(97,789)	(113,153)	2,593,095
FTE	<u>30.1</u>	<u>31.1</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>(1.8)</u>	<u>31.1</u>
General Fund	0	0	0	0	0
FTE	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cash Funds	1,905,869	173,002	0	0	173,002
FTE	26.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
RF/CFE	215,615	2,172,769	(97,789)	(113,153)	2,059,616
FTE	0.0	27.5	0.0	0.0	27.5
Federal Funds	268,653	360,477	0	0	360,477
FTE	3.6	3.6	0.0	0.0	3.6

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
(B) Div. of Private Occupational Schools					
Cash Funds	484,585	608,590	(15,001)	(20,001)	588,589
FTE	6.0	7.8	0.0	(0.3)	7.5
<i>Department of Personnel and Administration</i>					
<i>(5) Finance and Procurement</i>					
<i>(A) State Controller's Office and Procurement Services</i>					
<i>Personal Services</i>	<u>3,117,078</u>	<u>3,117,078</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3,117,078</u>
General Fund	1,151,705	1,151,705	0	(113,153)	1,038,552
Cash Funds	1,855,218	1,855,218	0	0	1,855,218
Reappropriated Funds	110,155	110,155	0	113,153	223,308
Total for Supplemental #3	5,723,147	6,071,439	(112,790)	(133,154)	5,938,285
FTE	<u>36.1</u>	<u>38.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>(2.1)</u>	<u>38.6</u>
General Fund	1,151,705	1,151,705	0	(113,153)	1,038,552
Cash Funds	4,245,672	2,636,810	(15,001)	(20,001)	2,616,809
Reappropriated Funds	325,770	2,282,924	(97,789)	0	2,282,924
<hr/>					
TOTAL					
Department of Higher Education	2,556,409,741	2,773,769,830	(46,950,229)	(63,672,639)	2,710,097,191
FTE	<u>19,256.4</u>	<u>19,803.3</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>(2.1)</u>	<u>19,801.2</u>
General Fund	747,405,868	812,937,855	(30,000,000)	(38,393,421)	774,544,434
Cash Funds	21,970,921	1,213,712,129	12,116,338	12,111,338	1,225,823,467
Reappropriated Funds	1,767,669,685	726,889,733	(29,066,567)	(37,390,556)	689,499,177

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
Federal Funds	19,363,267	20,230,113	0	0	20,230,113
TOTAL					
Department of Personnel	179,792,233	147,082,557	0	0	147,082,557
FTE	<u>535.1</u>	<u>392.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>392.9</u>
General Fund	10,760,474	6,378,983	0	(113,153)	6,265,830
Cash Funds	13,953,894	6,396,415	0	0	6,396,415
Reappropriated Funds	154,894,300	134,307,159	0	113,153	134,420,312
Federal Funds	183,565	0	0	0	0

Previously Approved Interim Supplementals

	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	Fiscal Year 2007-08 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
<i>(9) Auraria Higher Education Center</i>					
Auxiliary Enterprises - CF	2,440,000	100,000	(100,000)	(100,000)	0
<i>(4) College Opportunity Fund Program</i>					
Stipends - State	<u>312,405,160</u>	<u>327,010,920</u>	<u>2,685,272</u>	<u>2,685,272</u>	<u>329,696,192</u>
General Fund	312,405,160	323,975,244	2,685,272	2,685,272	326,660,516
Cash Funds Exempt	0	3,035,676	0	0	3,035,676
<i>Eligible Students (non-add)</i>	<i>121,087.3</i>	<i>122,476.0</i>	<i>1,005.7</i>	<i>1,005.7</i>	<i>123,482</i>

	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	Fiscal Year 2008-09 Supplemental		
	Actual	Appropriation	Requested Change	Recommended Change	New Total with Recommendation
<i>Rate per 30 Credit Hours (non-add)</i>	\$2,580	\$2,670	\$0	\$0	2,670
Fee-for-service Contracts - GF	266,575,756	300,643,438	(2,685,272)	(2,685,272)	297,958,166
TOTAL					
Department of Higher Education	2,349,112,025	2,556,073,789	(100,000)	(100,000)	2,556,073,789
FTE	<u>19,095.8</u>	<u>19,277.9</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>19,278</u>
General Fund	693,585,640	747,717,300	0	0	747,717,300
Cash Funds	36,737,347	23,304,523	(100,000)	(100,000)	23,204,523
CFE/RF	1,592,392,058	1,764,573,730	0	0	1,764,573,730
Federal Funds	26,396,980	20,478,236	0	0	20,478,236

Summary by Governing Board of Supplemental #2 - General Fund Reduction

FY 2008-09 Appropriation	Total	Adams	Mesa	Metro	Western	CSU Sys	Ft. Lewis	CU	Mines	UNC	CCs	LDJCs	AVS	Grand Total
Stipends	\$ 343,314,652	\$ 3,806,040	\$ 12,226,800	\$ 43,986,120	\$ 4,002,000	\$ 53,865,172	\$ 7,087,680	\$ 77,525,640	\$ 7,429,920	\$ 21,804,000	\$ 111,581,280			
Fee-for-service contracts	\$ 335,557,604	\$ 10,802,409	\$ 11,778,807	\$ 5,727,292	\$ 8,171,017	\$ 93,026,340	\$ 5,648,650	\$ 131,573,809	\$ 15,807,466	\$ 22,282,311	\$ 30,739,503			
SUBTOTAL	\$ 678,872,256	\$ 14,608,449	\$ 24,005,607	\$ 49,713,412	\$ 12,173,017	\$ 146,891,512	\$ 12,736,330	\$ 209,099,449	\$ 23,237,386	\$ 44,086,311	\$ 142,320,783	\$ 15,890,257	\$ 11,202,546	\$ 705,965,059
Tuition	\$ 1,102,511,135	\$ 7,811,548	\$ 25,043,804	\$ 52,397,880	\$ 9,307,422	\$ 205,236,426	\$ 24,746,531	\$ 526,718,894	\$ 55,389,258	\$ 52,398,876	\$ 143,460,496			
Supplemental #1 - Tuition and Fees	\$ 4,174,189	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 721,765	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 163,923	\$ -	\$ 3,288,501	\$ -	\$ -			
Tuition with supplemental	\$ 1,106,685,324	\$ 7,811,548	\$ 25,043,804	\$ 53,119,645	\$ 9,307,422	\$ 205,236,426	\$ 24,910,454	\$ 526,718,894	\$ 58,677,759	\$ 52,398,876	\$ 143,460,496			
Tobacco	\$ 18,943,716	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 18,943,716	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -			
Academic Fees	\$ 37,100,457	\$ 443,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 5,015,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 22,498,380	\$ 150,000	\$ 797,337	\$ 5,845,740			
Supplemental #1 - Tuition and Fees	\$ 7,957,150	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,062,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 895,150	\$ -	\$ -			
Academic Fees with Supplemental	\$ 45,057,607	\$ 443,000	\$ 425,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 26,000	\$ 12,077,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 22,498,380	\$ 1,045,150	\$ 797,337	\$ 5,845,740			
Appropriated Grants	\$ 2,375,531	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 170,000	\$ 48,000	\$ 657,531	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500,000			
TOTAL appropriation	\$ 1,851,934,434	\$ 22,862,997	\$ 49,474,411	\$ 103,733,057	\$ 21,506,439	\$ 364,374,938	\$ 38,694,784	\$ 777,917,970	\$ 82,960,295	\$ 97,282,524	\$ 293,127,019	\$ 15,890,257	\$ 11,202,546	\$ 1,879,027,237
Department Request														
Supplemental #2 - General Fund Reduction	\$ (28,968,778)	\$ (557,851)	\$ (923,321)	\$ (2,833,265)	\$ (463,186)	\$ (7,408,574)	\$ (613,404)	\$ (7,998,030)	\$ (850,129)	\$ (1,660,538)	\$ (5,660,480)	\$ (604,824)	\$ (426,398)	\$ (30,000,000)
Reduction as a percent of TOTAL approp.	-1.6%	-2.4%	-1.9%	-2.7%	-2.2%	-2.0%	-1.6%	-1.0%	-1.0%	-1.7%	-1.9%	-3.8%	-3.8%	-1.6%
Current funding per student as a percentage of peers (per CCHE's peer gap analysis)	64.8%	83.7%	60.4%	48.8%	79.8%	65.1%	68.7%	67.3%	86.9%	61.6%	62.0%	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
JBC Staff Recommendation														
2.0% reduction from TOTAL appropriation	\$ (37,038,688)	\$ (457,260)	\$ (989,488)	\$ (2,074,661)	\$ (430,129)	\$ (7,287,499)	\$ (773,896)	\$ (15,558,359)	\$ (1,659,206)	\$ (1,945,650)	\$ (5,862,540)	(654,558)	(461,460)	\$ (38,154,706)
Difference from Department Request	\$ (8,069,910)	\$ 100,591	\$ (66,167)	\$ 758,604	\$ 33,057	\$ 121,075	\$ (160,492)	\$ (7,560,329)	\$ (809,077)	\$ (285,112)	\$ (202,060)	\$ (49,734)	\$ (35,062)	\$ (8,154,706)