## MEETING OF <br> THE



# TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION 

Winter Quarterly Meeting
18th Floor, Parkway Towers
January 26, 2012

AGENDA

TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION<br>Winter Meeting<br>Commission Boardroom, Parkway Towers<br>January 26, 2012, 1:00 p.m. CST

Adoption of Agenda
Approval of Minutes: November 10 and December 20, 2011 Meetings
Chairman's Report
Executive Director's Report
Systems' Reports
University of Tennessee System
Tennessee Board of Regents

## I. Action Items

A. Move on When Ready Act: ACT Benchmark Adoption
B. Postsecondary Education Authorization

1. Authorization of New Institutions
2. Approval of New Programs
3. Conditional Approval of New Programs
4. Withdrawal of Rules from Attorney General
C. October 31 Revised Budgets, 2011-12

## II. Information Items

A. Academic Program Review
B. 2012 Lottery Scholarship Annual Report
C. UT - Center for Business and Economic Research Postsecondary Progression Study
D. GEAR UP, CACG, and Latino Student Success Grant Status Reports
E. 2012 Improving Teacher Quality Grants
F. Audit Committee Report
G. Legislative Report
H. Spring Quarterly Meeting, April 26, 2012

## MINUTES <br> TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

## November 10, 2011, 1:00 p.m. CDT

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Robert White at 1:00 p.m.
Commission Members present:

| Ms. Sue Atkinson | Mr. Jon Kinsey |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mr. Charles W. Bone | Mr. Charlie Mann |
| Mr. Greg Frye | Mr. Zack Walden |
| Ms. Sharon Hayes | Mr. Robert White |
| Mr. Cato Johnson |  |

## Adoption of Agenda

Mr. White welcomed all and thanked them for their attendance. He also welcomed the newest THEC member, Greg Frye, a student at UT Martin representing the University of Tennessee System. Mr. White then called for a motion to adopt the agenda as presented. Mr. Cato Johnson made a motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Charles Bone seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted.

## Approval of Minutes, July 28, 201 1, Meeting

Mr. White called for a motion to approve the minutes of the July 28, 2011, Commission meeting. Mr. Johnson made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Zack Walden seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted.

## Chairman's Report

Mr. White began his report by reviewing highlights of the worksession earlier in the day. He thanked Dr. Russ Deaton and Mr. David Wright for their presentations regarding implementation of the Complete College Tennessee Act; he emphasized the importance of the on-going work of the funding formula committee. Mr. White then noted that the following day was Veterans Day. He acknowledged the Veterans in the audience and thanked them for their service.

## Executive Director's Report/Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation

Dr. Richard G. Rhoda began by thanking everyone for their attendance and acknowledging former staff members and presidents emeritus who were present.

Dr. Rhoda discussed the status of the Complete College Act and noted that most of the agenda for the Commission meeting was within the context of the Act. He gave as an example the mission-distinctive B.S. in Environmental and Sustainability Studies at Tennessee Technological University. Dr. Rhoda also discussed specific completion initiatives: an outcomes-based funding Strategy Lab sponsored by the Lumina Foundation and hosted by THEC on October 24
with participants from ten other states; a recent Complete College Academy at which eight Tennessee institutions convened to discuss best practices and completion measures; and work that will begin in 2012 with the Public Agenda organization to increase community engagement in higher education across the state. He also noted that recommendations of the Senate Lottery Scholarship Stabilization task force were designed to enhance student completion.

In closing, Dr. Rhoda announced the retirement of Dr. Linda Doran at the end of December. He spoke to the many contributions of Dr. Doran over the course of her career that has been devoted to Tennessee higher education.

## Systems' Reports

## Tennessee Board of Regents

Dr. Paula Short, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Tennessee Board of Regents, was recognized to present the report. Dr. Short began her report by noting that the University of Memphis-Lambuth Campus had opened its doors to students for the fall semester. She introduced Dr. Dan Lattimore, Dean of the campus, to give a brief overview of current activities. Dr. Lattimore stated that classes started on August 29 with a headcount of 284 and anticipates an increase for the spring semester with the addition of more programs at both the undergraduate and graduate level. He also discussed recruiting plans, the physical condition of the Lambuth campus, and the legal status of Lambuth University's bankruptcy.

Dr. Short then discussed significant progress in efforts to improve student transfers among institutions. She also discussed the completion academy and noted that institutions will hold similar academies on campus.

## University of Tennessee

Dr. Joe DiPietro, President of the University of Tennessee, was recognized to present his report. Dr. DiPietro began his report by commenting on the increase in enrollment at the UT Chattanooga campus. He then informed the Commission of the renaming of the UT Knoxville Center for Interdisciplinary Research in Graduate Education in honor of former Governor Phil Bredesen.
Dr. DiPietro expressed concern about budget cuts and the need for capital funding, for planning, new buildings, and correcting maintenance problems. In closing, he spoke to the complete college academy, recommended changes in the lottery scholarship, and a UT compensation study that was underway.

## Action Items

## Approval of B.S. in Environmental and Sustainability Studies, TTU

Dr. Linda Doran, Associate Executive Director of Academic Affairs, was recognized. Dr. Doran briefed the Commission on the background of the Environmental and Sustainability Studies program. She stated that staff recommends approval of the program as presented. Dr. Doran noted that the program will: align to the existing interdisciplinary Environmental Science doctoral program; fulfill the educational goal of TTU's Center of Excellence for the Management, Utilization, and Protection of Water Resources to enhance
research, university instruction and educational outreach; draw on the resources of the University's Environmental Village; and capitalize on the services of the TTU Millard Oakley STEM Center, which fosters innovation in teaching and learning. After discussion, Mr. Johnson made a motion to approve the staff recommendation. Mr. Jon Kinsey seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted.

Temporary Authorization of New Institutions, Approval of New Programs Under the Postsecondary Authorization Act, and Conditional Approval of New Programs
Dr. Stephanie Bellard-Chase, Assistant Executive Director for Postsecondary School Authorization, was recognized. Dr. Bellard-Chase presented the recommendations of staff and the Postsecondary Education Authorization Advisory Committee to grant temporary authorization to proposed new institutions, new programs, and conditional authorization of new programs. A listing of the institutions and programs is included as Attachment A to the official copy of the minutes. A motion was made by Mr. Walden to adopt the recommendations as presented. Mr. Bone seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted.

Ms. Julie Woodruff, Director of Regulatory Affairs \& Complaint Resolution, was recognized to update the Commission on the Rule Making proceeding held in 2008. Ms. Woodruff stated that on October 17, 2011, Chancellor Ellen Hobbs Lyle issued an order in a declaratory action brought by National College of Business and Technology, and Remington College. It was determined that the proceeding to adopt the rules did not comply with Uniform Administrative Procedures Act. She noted that DPSA was working with the Attorney General's office to determine how to proceed and will keep the Commission informed of the progress.

## 2012-13 State Appropriations Recommendations

Dr. Deaton briefly reviewed 2012-13 state operating appropriation recommendations, as summarized on Attachment B to the official copy of these minutes. He noted that the recommendations include an increase of $\$ 19$ million for formula units, $\$ 3.2$ million for the TSAA award, and $\$ 6$ million for non-formula units; a 2.7 percent overall increase. The recommendations also included a five percent reduction distribution, as requested by the Department of Finance and Administration. Following discussion, Mr. White called for a motion. Mr. Johnson made a motion to approve. Ms. Sharon Hayes seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted

## 2012-13 Student Fee Recommendations

Dr. Deaton reviewed the staff recommendations for student fee increases, as summarized on Attachment $C$ to the official copy of these minutes. He noted a recommended increase of 3-6 percent for in-state tuition at all institutions, with the exception of University of Memphis and UT Knoxville where a 5 to 8 percent increase was recommended, and 5 to 10 percent at technology centers. A motion was made by Mr. Kinsey to approve staff recommendations. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted.

## Information Items

## Capital Outlay and Maintenance Priorities Assessment

Dr. Deaton then discussed Capital Outlay and Maintenance Priorities Assessment. He noted that UT and TBR had been asked to review their priorities listing to ensure that what was on the list is a top priority as well as to link those projects to the Complete College Tennessee Act and incorporate a matching requirement. Dr. Deaton stated that the proposals will be submitted to THEC in December.

## Title VI Implementation Plan Update and Compliance Report

Mr. Will Burns, Associate Executive Director of Legal and Regulatory Affairs, reviewed the Title VI Implementation Plan Update and Compliance Report. He noted that the purpose of the plan is to show how the state agency, and the entities to which its federal funds flow, is assuring compliance of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of a person's race, color, or national origin. Mr. Burns also gave an overview of the plan and noted that the plan was filed with the Comptroller's office on October 1, 2011.

## Fall 2011 Update on Enrollments and Graduates

Mr. David Wright, Associate Executive Director of Policy, Planning, and Research was recognized. Mr. Wright presented an overview of the Fall 2011 enrollments and graduates. He stated that after a period of above-average enrollment growth, public sector enrollments leveled off in the current term. He also stated that the statewide focus on postsecondary completion began to be evidenced by sizeable increases in completions, particularly in community college certificate programs. Mr. Wright noted that among graduate awards were post-bachelor's certificates, which were up 41.4 percent, and education specialist degrees, which decreased by 20.7 percent. He also noted that adult undergraduate completers were up 10 percent and increased their share of all undergraduate awards.

## Articulation and Transfer Report

Mr. Wright presented the annual report on articulation and transfer, submitted to the General Assembly in October 2011. He noted that transfer activity is analyzed for students who transferred in the fall 2010 semester. He then reviewed the tables and noted that the tables include transfer student demographics, a crosswalk of sending and receiving institutions, and an analysis of graduation for transfers compared to native students. Mr. Wright also reported on the progress of legislation and system activity to improve articulation.

## GEAR UP and College Access Challenge Grant Status Reports

Mr. Troy Grant, Director of the College Access Challenge Grant, was recognized to provide an updated report on the progress of GEAR UP TN and College Access

Challenge Grant (CACG). Mr. Grant gave a brief overview on highlights from the Latino Student Success, GEAR UP TN, and College Access Challenge Grant.

## Report on Effectiveness of Teacher Training Programs

Ms. Emily Carter, Higher Education Assistant Director for Race to the Top, was recognized to provide the report on the effectiveness of teacher training programs. Ms. Carter noted that the report was released on Tuesday, November 1 , and it is the fourth year the state has made data available to the public regarding the effectiveness of graduates from teacher training programs in the state. She also noted that over the past year, THEC staff have worked in collaboration with the teacher training programs, the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, and other key stakeholders to redesign the report card. The report provides information on teacher education completers' placement and retention rates, Praxis II exams, and the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System teacher effect scores. Key findings of the report include information related to the academic preparation of Tennessee's teachers and how well the programs' completers perform in the classroom.

## Race to the Top Implementation Status

Ms. Katrina Miller, Director of THEC First to the Top, was recognized to provide a status report on the Race to the Top Grant. Ms. Miller stated THEC's responsibility for implementing several projects of the state's First to the Top initiatives. She noted that THEC has been working closely with institutions of higher education and the TN Department of Education to ensure that the work aligns with the overall goals of education reform. Ms. Miller noted that one of the primary goals of the First to the Top agenda is implementing the Common Core State Standards that will dramatically increase the rigor of $\mathrm{K}-12$ education and lead to high school graduates who are college and career ready. Ms. Miller also noted that THEC convened a working group of Deans of Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences to integrate the Common Core State Standards into teacher training programs and briefed the Commission on the working group's plan for implementation.

## Partnership for Achieving Readiness in College and Career Update

Mr. Mike Krause, Director of Academic Affairs, was recognized. He stated that in January 2011, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission began a statewide engagement campaign to engage faculty from public institutions of higher education regarding the implementation of the Common Core Standards and ultimately, the PARCC assessment.

He commented that the PARCC assessment will be able to determine the college readiness of a student in Mathematics and English/Language Arts at the end of the junior year of high school. THEC, as well as both systems, have agreed to utilize the results of the PARCC assessment to determine whether the student will be eligible to enroll in credit-bearing courses or engage in remedial study.

Mr. Krause stated THEC constituted a Tennessee PARCC Steering Committee consisting of ELA and Math faculty, as well as institution administrators, who have been nominated and approved by their institution/system to serve as
representatives regarding all PARCC related matters. Specifically, to help ensure that college and career performance levels meet the needs of higher education in determining student readiness. The committee will guide the work the consortium undertakes to develop and/or identify effective intervention programs to increase the number of graduating high school seniors who meet college readiness standards prior to enrollment.

## Recent Trends in Veteran Enrollment in Tennessee Higher Education

Mr. Krause was recognized to provide an update on the Veteran enrollment in higher education institutions. He stated that there has been a statistically significant increase over past years. He also noted that the number of public institutions enrolling more than 200 veterans almost doubled, from 7 to 13 , with an overall trend statewide of substantial growth in veteran enrollment.

## Schedule of 2012 Commission Meetings

Dr. Rhoda advised the Commission that the meetings for 2012 would be: January 26, April 26, July 26, and November 15, 2012, in the THEC board room.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Approved:

Robert White
Chair

## MINUTES

## TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION <br> Called Meeting (Conference Call) December 20, 2011 , 2:00 p.m. CDT

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Robert White at 2:00 p.m. Commission Members present:

| Mr. Charles W. Bone | Dr. Gary Nixon |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mr. Greg Frye | Mr. Zack Walden |
| Mr. Tre Hargett | Mr. Robert White |
| Ms. Sharon Hayes | Mr. Justin Wilson |
| Mr. Greg Isaacs |  |

Chairman White thanked Commission members and guests for participating in this called meeting. He stated that the sole purpose of the meeting is to consider the 2012-13 Capital Projects Recommendation and the Five-Year Capital Projects Plan and noted that capital outlay and capital maintenance recommendations are usually considered at the regular November meeting of the Commission. This year, however, action was deferred in order to allow time for the development of a 'fresh approach' to capital planning and priorities.

He stated that discussions initiated by Governor Haslam and his staff, with the University of Tennessee, the Tennessee Board of Regents, and THEC staff resulted in a new approach that involves a long-term view of campus development in the context of the Complete College Tennessee Act and a dimension of institutional matching funds for capital outlay projects. However, it is necessary to have this meeting at this time even though a quorum is not physically present at the commission office so that the recommendation can be submitted to the Governor for consideration in his 2012-2013 budget recommendation.

He then asked for a motion stating that the Commission recognizes the urgency to act on this matter now, notwithstanding the fact that a physical quorum could not be convened. Mr. Zack Walden made a motion to state the Commission recognizes the urgency to act. Mr. Charles Bone seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted by the following roll call vote:

|  | Aye | No | Abstain |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mr. Charles W. Bone | x |  |  |
| Mr. Tre Hargett | x |  |  |
| Ms. Sharon Hayes | x |  |  |
| Mr. Greg Isaacs | x |  |  |
| Mr. Zack Walden | x |  |  |
| Mr. Robert White | x |  |  |
| Mr. Justin Wilson | x |  |  |

Chairman White expressed his appreciation to Governor Haslam for his encouragement for this new approach, noting that it provides a realistic framework for campus development across the state. He then recognized Dr. Rhoda for remarks.

Dr. Rhoda made reference to the meeting material (Attachment A to the official copy of the minutes) which set forth the 2012-13 capital funding recommendations and five-year plan. He commented on the process through which the recommendations were developed. He emphasized the new matching provision for capital outlay projects.

Dr. Rhoda then recognized Dr. Russ Deaton to provide further information on the 2012-13 Capital Projects recommendation and Five-year Capital Projects Plan. Dr. Deaton stated that staff recommends state funding for 41 capital maintenance projects in the amount of $\$ 84$ million, three capital outlay projects in the amount of $\$ 245$ million - $\$ 40$ million of that recommendation being generated by institutions in matching funds, 27 capital projects funded by nonstate revenue sources for TBR totaling $\$ 126$ million, and 33 capital projects for UT totaling $\$ 128$ million. He noted that the 5 year plan totaled $\$ 2.1$ billion and of that, $\$ 1.8$ billion is state funded and $\$ 272$ million is matching funds. Dr. Deaton also reviewed the features of the recommendation that includes linkages to the Complete College Tennessee Act which are increasing educational attainment and workforce development.

After discussion, Mr. White called for a motion to adopt staff recommendations. Mr. Greg Isaacs made a motion to approve staff recommendations. Ms. Sharon Hayes seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted with a majority vote by the following roll call:

|  | Aye | No | Abstain |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mr. Charles W. Bone | x |  |  |
| Mr. Tre Hargett |  |  | x |
| Ms. Sharon Hayes | x |  |  |
| Mr. Greg Isaacs | x |  |  |
| Mr. Zack Walden | x |  |  |
| Mr. Robert White | x |  |  |
| Mr. Justin Wilson |  | x |  |

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

## Approved:

DATE: January 26, 2012
SUBJECT: Public Chapter 488, Move On When Ready Act
ACTION RECOMMENDED: Approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Public Chapter 488 enacts the Move on When Ready Act, a measure which allows certain exemplary high school students to participate in an early graduation program and enter higher education. As required by PC 488, students who elect to participate in this program are required to meet an array of benchmarks, the details of which are included in Attachment A.

Section 4 of the law requires the Tennessee Higher Education Commission to set benchmarks on the ACT and SAT subject test in English and mathematics, and subsection (h) further states that "...the Tennessee Higher Education Commission shall set the required benchmarks at scores that demonstrate exemplary high school performance and are indicative of an ability to perform college-level work."

Based upon this requirement, it is recommended that a 27 on both the ACT English and mathematics subject tests be adopted as the benchmark score for students to participate in this program. According to research conducted in other states, the SAT concordance is a 610 - SAT Math/ 590- SAT English.

This determination is based on the predictive data provided by ACT (Attachment B) regarding the concordance between a score of 27 on these subject areas and the likelihood of success in a credit bearing college course in both English and math. Having attained the benchmark of 27 in both subject areas, a student has approximately a $75 \%$ chance of scoring a B or higher in the entry level subject course and an $86 \%$ chance of attaining a C or higher.

This high likelihood of success, coupled with the other rigorous benchmarks enumerated in the statute, assure that only the highest achieving students will be eligible for participation.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION INCLUDED: Additional requirements listed in the statute and developed by the State Board of Education under the Move On When Ready Act are listed in Attachment A. The Estimated Probability of Success table is included as Attachment B.

## Attachment A <br> Move On When Ready Act Requirements Effective 2012-13 school year

1. Earned 18 credits:
o English I, II, III, IV
o Algebra I and II
o Geometry
o United States History
o Two courses in the same foreign language
o One course selected from the following: Economics, Government, World Civilization, or World Geography
o One course selected from the following: History and appreciation of visual and performing arts, a standards based arts course which may include: studio art, band, chorus, dance or other performing art
o Health
o Physical Education
o Biology
o Chemistry
2. Have a cumulative GPA of at least 3.2 on a 4 point scale
3. Scored at the advanced level on all state end of course tests
4. Met benchmark scores on the ACT or SAT examinations in mathematics and English as determined by THEC
5. Scored a 3 or better on an Advanced Placement (AP) world language assessment
6. Completed two courses in AP, International Baccalaureate (IB), dual enrollment or dual credit offerings

# Attachment B <br> Move on When Ready Act Estimated Probability of Success <br> ACT Predictive Analysis <br> (Source: ACT) 

$\left.\left.\begin{array}{c|cccc}\begin{array}{c}\text { Subject } \\ \text { Criterion }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { English } \\ \text { B or higher } \\ \text { English } \\ \text { Comp. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { English } \\ \text { C or higher } \\ \text { English } \\ \text { Comp. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Math } \\ \text { B or higher } \\ \text { College } \\ \text { Algebra }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Math or higher } \\ \text { College }\end{array} \\ \text { Course } & & & & \text { Algebra }\end{array}\right] \begin{array}{cccc}\text { ACT } & & \text { Estimated Probability of Success }\end{array}\right]$


1. Program: Leadership
Credential Awarded: Master of Science
Length of Program: 36 Semester Credit Hours (24 Months Full-Time) (48 Months Part-Time)
2. Program: Business AdministrationCredential Awarded:Length of Program:
Master of Business Administration36 Semester Credit Hours (24 Months Full-Time)(48 Months Part-Time)
3. Program:Business Administration/LeadershipCredential Awarded:Length of Program:
Master of Business Administration42 Semester Credit Hours (30 Months Full-Time)(60 Months Part-Time)
4. Program: Business Administration/Sports AdministrationCredential Awarded:Length of Program:
Master of Business Administration42 Semester Credit Hours (30 Months Full-Time)(60 Months Part-Time)
5. Program:Credential Awarded:Length of Program:Public AdministrationMaster of Public Administration36 Semester Credit Hours (24 Months Full-Time)(48 Months Part-Time)
6. Program:
Credential Awarded:Length of Program:
Sports Administration
Master of Sports Administration
36 Semester Credit Hours (24 Months Full-Time)(48 Months Part-Time
7. Program:Credential Awarded:Length of Program:8. Program:Credential Awarded:Length of Program:

ManagementBachelor of Science124 Semester Credit Hours (48 Months Full-Time)(96 Months Part-Time)

General Studies
Associate of Arts 61 Semester Credit Hours (24 Months Full-Time) (48 Months Part-Time)

## C. EduMed Partners, LLC 109 Rivergate Parkway, Suite D2, Goodlettsville, TN 37072

Corporate Structure:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:

Limited Liability Corporation
None
No

EduMed is seeking approval for three new programs. The programs will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Goodlettsville, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded: Certificate of Completion
Length of Program: 520 Contact Hours
(5.5 Months)
2. Program: Phlebotomy Technician

Credential Awarded: Certificate of Completion
Length of Program: 280 Contact Hours
(3.5 Months)
3. Program:

Pharmacy Technician
Credential Awarded: Certificate of Completion
Length of Program: 320 Contact Hours
(4 Months)

## D. HRB Tax Group, Inc.

1441 New Highway 96 West, Franklin, TN 37064

Corporate Structure:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:

For-Profit Corporation
None
No

HRB Tax Group, Inc. is seeking approval for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Franklin, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded: Certificate
Length of Program: 84 Contact Hours (3.6 Months)

H\&R Block Introduction to Income Tax Course

## E. HRB Tax Group, Inc. 306 Main Street, Jacksboro, TN 37757

Corporate Structure:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:

For-Profit Corporation
None
No

HRB Tax Group, Inc. is seeking approval for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Jacksboro, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

H\&R Block Introduction to Income Tax Course
Certificate
84 Contact Hours (3.6 Months)

## F. Lab Four Career Training Institute 937 Herman Street, Nashville, TN 37208

Corporate Structure: Sole Proprietorship
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
None
No
Lab Four Career Institute - Nashville is seeking approval for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Nashville, Tennessee.

1. Program: Weatherization Auditor

Credential Awarded: Certificate of Completion
Length of Program:
72 Contact Hours
(3 Months Part-Time)

## G. Liberty Tax Service - Jonesborough

 1000 W. Jackson Blvd., Suite 9, Jonesborough, TN 37659| Corporate Structure: | C-Corporation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Accreditation: | None |
| Title IV Funding: | No |

Liberty Tax Service is seeking approval for two new programs. The programs will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Jonesborough, Tennessee.

| 1. | Program: <br> Credential Awarded: <br> Length of Program: | Basic Income Tax Course <br> Certificate <br> $36-60$ Contact Hours |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (1.5 to 2.5 Months) |  |  |  |

## H. MaySept Healthcare 4514 Summer Avenue, Memphis, TN 38122

Corporate Structure:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:

Sole Proprietorship
None
No

MaySept Healthcare Services is seeking approval for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Memphis, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded: Certificate of Completion
Length of Program:

Nurse Aide
91 Contact Hours
(3 Weeks Full-Time)
(6 Weeks Part-Time)

## I. Yip Yap School of Grooming 2304 Park Plus Drive, Columbia, TN 38401

| Corporate Structure: | Sole Proprietorship |
| :--- | :--- |
| Accreditation: | None |
| Title IV Funding: | No |

Yip Yap School of Grooming is seeking approval for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Columbia, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded: Certified Master All Breeds Professional Groomer Length of Program: 450 Contact Hours (3 Months)

DATE: January 26, 2012
SUBJECT: Approval of New Programs under the Postsecondary Authorization Act ACTION RECOMMENDED: Approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The Commission, under the Postsecondary Authorization Act, has the "power and duty" to act upon applications for authorization of educational programs in the state. Applications have been reviewed and staff has determined that all necessary documentation for the institutions submitting new program applications is in accordance with the Act and postsecondary rules. The Committee on Postsecondary Educational Institutions, which is a review and advisory committee to the Commission, met on January 12, 2012 and affirmed staff recommendations for approval.
A. Art Institute of Tennessee - Nashville Nashville, TN

Corporate Structure: C-Corporation
Authorization Date: July 24, 2008
Accreditation: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
Title IV Funding:
Yes
Highest Credential Offered: Bachelors Degree
The Art Institute of Tennessee - Nashville is seeking authorization for four new programs. The programs will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Nashville, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded: Bachelor of Fine Arts
Length of Program:
2. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
3. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
4. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

Graphic and Web Design/Graphic Design
180 Quarter Credit Hours (48 months)
Graphic and Web Design/Web Design
Bachelor of Fine Arts
180 Quarter Credit Hours (48 months)
Graphic and Web Design/Graphic Design
Associates of Arts
90 Quarter Credit Hours (24 months)
Graphic and Web Design/Web Design
Associates of Arts
90 Quarter Credit Hours (24 months)

## B. Cambridge College

Memphis, TN
Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:

Not-for-Profit Corporation
June 21, 2007
New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC)
Yes
Masters Degree

Cambridge College is seeking authorization for seven new programs. The programs will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Memphis, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
2. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
3. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
4. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
5. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
6. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
Early Childhood (PreK-2) (Non-Licensure)
Master of Education
37 Semester Credit Hours

Elementary Education (1-6) (Non-Licensure)
Master of Education 38 Semester Credit Hours (12 months Full-Time) (24 months Part-Time)

Interdisciplinary Studies (Non-Licensure) Master of Education
32 Semester Credit Hours (12 months Full-Time)
(24 months Part-Time)
Mathematics Education (Non-Licensure)
Master of Education
33 Semester Credit Hours (12 months Full-Time)
(24 months Part-Time)

$$
\text { ( } 24 \text { months Part-1ime) }
$$

$$
0^{2}
$$

School Administration (Non-Licensure)
Masters of Education
32 Semester Credit Hours (12 months Full-Time)
(24 months Part-Time)
Teacher of Students with Moderate Disabilities Master of Education
40 Semester Credit Hours (12 months Full-Time)
(24 months Part-Time)

| 7. | Program: | School Administration (Non-licensure with <br> Practicum) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies/ <br>  <br> Length of Program: | Education Specialist |
|  | 36 Semester Credit Hours | (16 months Full-Time) |

## C. Capella University

Minneapolis, MN
Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
January 28, 2010
Title IV Funding:
Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
Highest Credential Offered:
Yes
Doctoral Degree
Capella University is seeking authorization for eight new programs. The programs will be offered in a distance learning format. The institution is recruitment only, and all classes are available on-line.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
2. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
3. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
4. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
5. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

Advanced Studies in Human Behavior/General Advanced Studies in Human Behavior Doctor of Philosophy 120 Quarter Credit Hours (60 months Full-Time) (84 months Part-Time)

Psychology/Addiction Psychology Doctor of Philosophy 120 Quarter Credit Hours (48 months Full-Time) (84 months Part-Time)

Social Work/General Social Work Doctor of Social Work
74 Quarter Credit Hours (36 months Full-Time) (84 months Part-Time)

Homeland Security
Master of Science
52 Quarter Credit Hours (24 months Full-Time) (48 months Part-Time)

Studies in Human Behavior/General Studies in Human Behavior
Master of Science
48 Quarter Credit Hours (24 months Full-Time) (48 months Part-Time)

| 6. | Program: <br> Credential Awarded: <br> Length of Program: | Business Intelligence |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Master of Business Administration |  |
|  |  | 48 Quarter Credit Hours | (24 months Full-Time) |
|  |  |  | (48 months Part-Time) |
| 7. | Program: | Entrepreneurship |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Master of Business Administration |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 48 Quarter Credit Hours | (24 months Full-Time) |
|  |  |  | (48 months Part-Time) |
| 8. | Program: | Nonprofit Management and Leadership |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Master of Nonprofit Management and Leadership |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 52 Quarter Credit Hours | ( 24 months Full-Time) <br> (48 months Part-Time) |
|  |  |  |  |

## D. Chattanooga College Medical, Dental, \& Technical Chattanooga, TN Center

Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:

S-Corporation
January 1, 1974
Accrediting Commission Career Schools \& Colleges (ACCSC)
Yes
Associate Degree

Chattanooga College Medical, Dental \& Technical Careers is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

| 1. Program: | Practical Nursing |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Diploma |  |
| Length of Program: | 82 Quarter Credit Hours |  |

## E. Dallas Theological Seminary

## Knoxville, TN

| Corporate Structure: | Not-For-Profit Corporation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Accreditation: | Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, <br> Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Commission on Accrediting of the Association of <br> Title IV Funding: |
| Theological Schools (CAATS) |  |
| Highest Credential Offered: | Yes |
|  | Masters Degree |

Dallas Theological Seminary is seeking approval for one new program. This program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Knoxville, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

Christian Leadership
Master of Arts
62 Semester Credit Hours (66 months Part-Time)
F. Grand Canyon University

Phoenix, AZ
Corporate Structure: C-Corporation
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:

July 23, 2009
Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
Yes
Doctorate Degree

Grand Canyon University is seeking authorization for eighteen new programs. The programs will be offered in an distance learning format. The institution is recruitment only and all programs will be offered on-line.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
2. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
3. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
4. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
5. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
6. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
7. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
8. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

General Psychology
Doctor of Philosophy
60 Semester Credit Hours (38 months Part-Time)
Management
Doctor of Business Administration
60 Semester Credit Hours (34 months Part-Time)
Christian Studies
Master of Arts
38 Semester Credit Hours (18 months Part-Time)
Public Administration
Master of Arts
38 Semester Credit Hours (18 months Part-Time)
Strategic Human Resource Management
Master of Business Administration
54 Semester Credit Hours (25 months Part-Time)
Leadership
Master of Business Administration and Master of Science
66 Semester Credit Hours (31 months Part-Time)
Public Health
Master of Public Health
48 Semester Credit Hours (23 months Part-Time)
Accounting
Master of Science
50 Semester Credit Hours (23 months Part-Time)
9. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
10. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
11. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
12. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
13. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
14. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
15. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
16. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
17. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
18. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

Criminal Justice
Master of Science
40 Semester Credit Hours (20 months Part-Time)
Health Care Administration
Master of Science
48 Semester Credit Hours (23 months Part-Time)
Health Care Informatics
Master of Science
48 Semester Credit Hours (23 months Part-Time)
Psychology
Master of Science
36 Semester Credit Hours (18 months Part-Time)
Business Management
Bachelor of Science
120 Semester Credit Hours (51 months Part-Time)
Health Care Administration
Bachelor of Science
120 Semester Credit Hours (51 months Part-Time)
Health Sciences: Professional Development and
Advanced Patient Care
Bachelor of Science
120 Semester Credit Hours (48 months Part-Time)
Medical Imaging Science
Bachelor of Science
120 Semester Credit Hours (49 months Part-Time)
Respiratory Care
Bachelor of Science
120 Semester Credit Hours (48 months Part-Time)
Sports Management
Bachelor of Science
120 Semester Credit Hours (51 months Part-Time)
G. Huntington College of Health Sciences

Knoxville, TN

Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:

S-Corporation
May 19, 1995
Distance Education and Training Council (DETC)

## Title IV Funding: No

Highest Credential Offered: Masters Degree
Huntington College of Health Sciences is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a distance learning format. The institution is recruitment only and all classes are available on-line.

| 1. Program: | Medical Business Administration |
| :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Masters of Medical Business Administration |
| Length of Program: | 36 Semester Credit Hours (12 months) |

## H. Kaplan University

## Chicago, IL

Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
C-Corporation

Title IV Funding:
November 19, 2009
Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
Highest Credential Offered:
Yes
Masters Degree
Kaplan University is seeking authorization for eight new programs. The programs will be offered in a distance learning format. The institution is recruitment only, and all classes are available on-line.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded
Length of Program:
Instructional Design for Organizations
Graduate Certificate
21 Quarter Credit Hours (5 months Full-Time) (10 months Part-Time)
2. Program: K-12 Educational Leadership

Credential Awarded: Graduate Certificate
Length of Program:
17 Quarter Credit Hours (5 months Full-Time) (10 months Part-Time)
3. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
4. Program:

Credential Awarded
Length of Program:
5. Program: Mathematics - Specialization in Elementary Grades

Credential Awarded
Literacy and Language Teaching - Specialization in Grades K-6
Graduate Certificate
17 Quarter Credit Hours (5 months Full-Time) (10 months Part-Time)

Literacy and Language Teaching - Specialization in Grades 6-12
Graduate Certificate
17 Quarter Credit Hours (5 months Full-Time) (10 months Part-Time)

Length of Program:

17 Quarter Credit Hours (5 months Full-Time) (10 months Part-Time)

| 6. | Program: | Mathematics - Specialization in Secondary Grades |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Graduate Certificate |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 17 Quarter Credit Hours | (5 months Full-Time) <br> (10 months Part-Time) |
| 7. | Program: | Online College Teaching |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Graduate Certificate |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 20 Quarter Credit Hours | (5 months Full-Time) <br> ( 10 months Part-Time) |
| 8. | Program: | Teaching with Technology |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Graduate Certificate |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 17 Quarter Credit Hours | (5 months Full-Time) |
|  |  |  | (10 months Part-Time) |

## I. Miller-Motte Technical College

Clarksville, TN
Corporate Structure: For-profit Corporation
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:
January 1, 1987
Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges
and Schools (ACICS)
Yes
Associate Degree
Miller Motte Technical College is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Clarksville, Tennessee.

| 1. | Program: | Phlebotomy Technician |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Certificate of Completion |  |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 200 Contact Hours | $(2.75$ months) |

## J. Miller-Motte Technical College Madison, TN

Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:

For-profit Corporation
July 17, 2003
Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS)
Yes
Associate Degree

Miller Motte Technical College is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Madison, Tennessee.

| 1. Program: | Phlebotomy Technician |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Certificate of Completion <br> Length of Program: | 200 Contact Hours |

## K. National American University

Rapid City, SD

| Corporate Structure: | C-Corporation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Authorization Date: | July 24, 2008 |
| Accreditation: | Higher Learning Commission (HLC) |
| Title IV Funding: | Yes |
| Highest Credential Offered: | Masters Degree |

National American University is seeking authorization for eighteen new programs. The programs will be offered in a distance learning format. The institution is recruitment only, and all classes are available on-line.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
2. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
3. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
4. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
5. Program:

Credential Awarded: Length of Program:
6. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
7. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:
8. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

Business Administration/Accounting (Non-Thesis)
Master of Business Administration
54 Quarter Credit Hours (18 months)
Business Administration/Accounting (Thesis)
Master of Business Administration
54 Quarter Credit Hours (18 months)
Management/Criminal Justice (Non-Thesis)
Master of Business Administration
54 Quarter Credit Hours (18 months)
Management/Criminal Justice (Thesis)
Master of Business Administration
54 Quarter Credit Hours (18 months)
Management/Proprietary Higher Education
(Non-Thesis)
Master of Business Administration
54 Quarter Credit Hours (18 months)
Management/Proprietary Higher Education (Thesis)
Master of Business Administration
54 Quarter Credit Hours (18 months)
Business Administration/Entrepreneurship
Bachelor of Science
186 Quarter Credit Hours (36 months)
Business Administration/Supply Chain
Management
Bachelor of Science
186 Quarter Credit Hours (36 months)

| 9. | Program: | Information Technology/Co Forensics | uter Security and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Bachelor of Science |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 186 Quarter Credit Hours | (36 months) |
| 10. | Program: | Tourism and Hospitality Management |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Bachelor of Science |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 186 Quarter Credit Hours | (36 months) |
| 11. | Program: | Electronic Health Record Support Specialist Associate of Applied Science |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: |  |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 93 Quarter Credit Hours | (18 months) |
| 12. | Program: | Computer Security |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Associate of Applied Science |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 93 Quarter Credit Hours | (18 months) |
| 13. | Program: | Medical Administrative Assistant |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Associate of Applied Science |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 93 Quarter Credit Hours | (18 months) |
| 14. | Program: | Small Business Management |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Associate of Applied Science |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 93 Quarter Credit Hours | (18 months) |
| 15. | Program: | Business Logistics |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Associate of Applied Science |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 93 Quarter Credit Hours | (18 months) |
| 16. | Program: | Computer Support Specialist |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Diploma |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 58.5 Quarter Credit Hours | (18 months) |
| 17. | Program: | Microsoft Certified IT Professional Network Management |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Diploma |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 58.5 Quarter Credit Hours | (18 months) |
| 18. | Program: | Network and Server Administrator |  |
|  | Credential Awarded: | Diploma |  |
|  | Length of Program: | 58.5 Quarter Credit Hours (18 months) |  |
|  | Strayer University - Online |  | hantilly, VA |
| Corporate Structure: |  | C-Corporation |  |
| Authorization Date: |  | November 14, 2002 |  |
| Accreditation: |  | Middle States Association of Colleges and School Commission on Higher Learning (MSACHE) Yes |  |
| Title | IV Funding: |  |  |

Highest Credential Offered: Masters Degree
Strayer University is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a distance learning format. This institution is recruitment only and all instruction is provided on-line.

| 1. | Program: | Business Administration |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Executive Master of Business Administration |  |
| Length of Program: | 54 Quarter Credit Hours | $(18$ months Full-Time) |

## M. Strayer University - Knoxville

Knoxville, TN

| Corporate Structure: | C-Corporation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Authorization Date: | November 16, 2006 |
| Accreditation: | Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, |
|  | Commission on Higher Learning (MSACHE) |
| Title IV Funding: | Yes |
| Highest Credential Offered: | Masters Degree |

Strayer University is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a distance learning format. Instruction will be provided on-line by faculty from their authorized site in Knoxville, Tennessee.

| 1. | Program: | Business Administration |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Executive Master of Business Administration |  |
| Length of Program: | 54 Quarter Credit Hours | $(18$ months Full-Time) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## N. Strayer University - Shelby <br> Memphis, TN

Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:

Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:

C-Corporation
November 16, 2006
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Learning (MSACHE) Yes
Masters of Arts

Strayer University is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a distance learning format. Instruction will be provided on-line by faculty from their authorized site (Shelby) in Memphis, Tennessee.

## 1. Program: <br> Credential Awarded: Length of Program:

Business Administration
Executive Master of Business Administration
54 Quarter Credit Hours (18 months Full-Time)
(36 months Part-Time)

Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:

C-Corporation
November 14, 2002
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Learning (MSACHE)
Yes
Masters Degree

Strayer University is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a distance learning format. Instruction will be provided on-line by faculty from their authorized site (Thousand Oaks) in Memphis, Tennessee.

| 1. | Program: | Business Administration |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Executive Master of Business Administration |  |
| Length of Program: | 54 Quarter Credit Hours | $(18$ months Full-Time) |

## P. Strayer University - Nashville

Nashville, TN
Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
C-Corporation
November 14, 2002
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Higher Learning (MSACHE)
Yes
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered: Masters Degree
Strayer University is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a distance learning format. Instruction will be provided on-line by faculty from their authorized site in Nashville, Tennessee.

1. Program:
Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

Business Administration
Executive Master of Business Administration 54 Quarter Credit Hours (18 months Full-Time)
(36 months Part-Time)

## Q. Sullivan University

Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:

Louisville, KY
S-Corporation
January 1, 1989
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
Yes
Masters Degree

Sullivan University is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a distance learning format. The institution is recruitment only and all classes are available on-line.

| 1. Program: | Supply Chain Management |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Associate of Science |  |
| Length of Program: 96 Quarter Credit Hours | (18 months Full-Time) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## R. Vatterrott Career College - Appling Farms

Memphis, TN

Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:

For-Profit Corporation
October 18, 2007
Accrediting Commission for Career Schools and Colleges (ACCSC)
Yes
Associate Degree

Vatterott Career College - Appling Farms is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Memphis, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Information Systems and Security Specialist
Credential Awarded: Associate of Applied Occupational Science
Length of Program: 113 Quarter Credit Hours (20 months)

## S. Vatterrott Career College - Dividend Memphis ,TN

Corporate Structure: For-Profit Corporation
Authorization Date:
January 28, 2010
Accreditation:
Accrediting Commission for Career Schools and Colleges (ACCSC)
Title IV Funding: Yes
Highest Credential Offered: Associate Degree
Vatterott Career College - Dividend Drive is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Memphis, Tennessee.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

Information Systems and Security Specialist Associate of Applied Occupational Science 113 Quarter Credit Hours (20 months)

## T. Victory University

Memphis, TN

Corporate Structure:
Authorization Date:
Accreditation:
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered:

For-Profit Corporation
April 29, 2010
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
Yes
Masters Degree

Victory University is seeking authorization for two new programs. The programs will be offered in a blended format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Memphis, Tennessee, as well as on-line.

1. Program:

Credential Awarded: Bachelor of Arts
Length of Program:
2. Program:

Credential Awarded:
Length of Program:

English
120 Semester Credit Hours (40 months Full-Time) (80 months Part-Time)

Learning Counselor Counseling Certificate 18 Semester Credit Hours

Agenda Item: I.B.3.
DATE: January 26, 2012

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Conditional Approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The Commission, under the Postsecondary Authorization Act, has the "power and duty" to act upon applications for authorization of educational programs in the state. Applications have been reviewed and staff has determined that all necessary documentation for the institutions submitting new program applications is in accordance with the Act and postsecondary rules. The Committee on Postsecondary Educational Institutions, which is a review and advisory committee to the Commission, met on January 12, 2012 and affirmed staff recommendations for conditional approval.

## A. Concorde Career College <br> Memphis, TN

Corporate Structure: C-Corporation
Authorization Date: January 1, 1985
Accreditation: Council on Occupational Education (COE)
Title IV Funding: Yes
Highest Credential Offered: Associate Degree
Concorde Career College is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Memphis, Tennessee.

1. Program: Nursing

Credential Awarded: Associate of Applied Science
Length of Program: 70 Semester Credit Hours (15 months)
While this program is conditionally authorized, the institution may not advertise the program, recruit or enroll students into the program.

At the time that the institution provides evidence sufficient to DPSA staff of possession and installation of the required program equipment and a successful site visit is conducted by DPSA staff, the condition will be lifted without further Commission action and this program will receive Regular Authorization Status. At that time, the institution may begin to advertise this program, recruit and enroll students into the program.

| Corporate Structure: | Not-For-Profit Corporation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Authorization Date: | July 17, 2003 |
| Accreditation: | Accrediting Commission for Career Schools and |
|  | Colleges (ACCSC) |
| Title IV Funding: | Yes - Institutional |
|  | No - For This Program |
| Highest Credential Offered: | Associate Degree |

Remington College-Nashville is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Nashville, Tennessee.

| 1. Program: | Coronal Polishing for the Dental Assistant |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Credential Awarded: | Certificate of Completion |  |
| Length of Program: | 14 Contact Hours | (2 days) |

Remington College - Nashville has submitted a letter of approval by the Tennessee Board of Dentistry for the Coronal Polishing Certification Course effective through December 31, 2011. An application for the renewal of the board approval for the Coronal Polishing Certification Course has been submitted to the Tennessee Board of Dentistry for the January 26, 2012 board meeting.

While this program is conditionally authorized, the institution may not advertise the program, recruit or enroll students into the program.

At the time that the institution provides proof of approval from the Tennessee Board of Dentistry to DPSA staff, the condition will be lifted without further Commission action and this program will receive Regular Authorization Status. At that time, the institution may begin to advertise this program, recruit and enroll students into the program.

## C. Virginia College School of Business and Health Chattanooga, TN

Corporate Structure: Limited Liability Corporation
Authorization Date: July 27, 2006
Accreditation:
Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS) Yes
Title IV Funding:
Highest Credential Offered: Associate Degree
Virginia College School of Business and Health is seeking authorization for one new program. The program will be offered in a residential format. Instruction will be provided by faculty from their authorized site in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

1. Program: Occupational Therapy Assistant

Credential Awarded: Associate of Applied Science
Length of Program: 96 Quarter Credit Hours (22 months)
While this program is conditionally authorized, the institution may not advertise the program, recruit or enroll students into the program.

At the time that the institution provides evidence sufficient to DPSA staff of possession and installation of the required program equipment and a successful site visit is conducted by DPSA staff, the condition will be lifted without further Commission action and this program will receive Regular Authorization Status. At that time, the institution may begin to advertise this program, recruit and enroll students into the program.

DATE: January 26, 2012
SUBJECT: October 31 Revised Budgets, FY 11-12

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Approval

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The General Appropriations Act requires that the operating budgets of all higher education units be submitted by the respective governing boards to the Higher Education Commission. Each higher education system submits operating budget estimates two times each year. The initial and revised estimates are referred to as the July 1 and October 31 operating budgets, respectively. These two operating budget estimates are compared throughout the enclosed material.

The budgets are to be submitted, with the Commission's action and comments, to the Department of Finance and Administration for review and approval.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS: The FY 2011-12 revised operating budgets for higher education are balanced. Campuses have again directed the majority of their resources to the teaching functions. Expenditures for auxiliary enterprises have not exceeded revenues plus unallocated auxiliary fund balances. All higher education budget entities have submitted the required financial data to the Commission and are in compliance with all the budget guidelines and legislative directives.

Overall, 53.2 percent of all revenue was generated from tuition and fees compared to 39.3 percent five years prior in FY 2006-07. State appropriations accounted for 35.8 percent of revenue, compared to 48.9 percent in FY 2006-07. Teaching functions - instruction, research, public service, and academic support - comprised 63.6 percent of all expenditures.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the Commission approve the revised FY 2011-12 October 31 budgets, authorize the Executive Director to make technical adjustments to the budgets if necessary and transmit the approval of the referenced budgets, along with the appropriate commentary, to the Commissioner of Finance and Administration.

Table 1

## Tennessee Higher Education Commission

| Academic Formula Units | Total FY 2008-09 Appropriation* | Total FY 2009-10 Appropriation* | Total FY 2010-11 <br> Appropriation* | Total FY 2011-12 Appropriation* | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2011-12 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities |  |  |  |  |  |
| Austin Peay | \$32,935,800 | \$27,228,700 | \$25,570,600 | \$26,107,600 | \$537,000 |
| East Tennessee | 57,792,100 | 48,353,800 | 45,582,600 | 44,000,700 | $(1,581,900)$ |
| Middle Tennessee | 91,965,400 | 76,102,500 | 71,318,700 | 73,423,800 | 2,105,100 |
| Tennessee State | 38,448,300 | 30,371,100 | 28,554,800 | 29,335,100 | 780,300 |
| Tennessee Tech | 45,198,900 | 38,341,600 | 35,853,000 | 35,086,300 | $(766,700)$ |
| University of Memphis | 113,093,400 | 97,397,500 | 91,785,400 | 85,464,300 | $(6,321,100)$ |
| Subtotal | \$379,433,900 | \$317,795,200 | \$298,665,100 | \$293,417,800 | (\$5,247,300) |
| Two-Year Colleges |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chattanooga | \$23,667,300 | \$21,297,300 | \$20,086,100 | \$19,970,200 | (\$115,900) |
| Cleveland | 10,271,300 | 9,408,300 | 9,062,000 | 8,421,200 | $(640,800)$ |
| Columbia | 13,246,700 | 12,025,200 | 11,439,800 | 11,121,800 | $(318,000)$ |
| Dyersburg | 7,190,000 | 6,506,300 | 6,168,000 | 6,484,500 | 316,500 |
| Jackson | 12,393,900 | 11,104,800 | 10,479,000 | 10,518,500 | 39,500 |
| Motlow | 10,302,500 | 9,159,600 | 8,591,400 | 9,662,900 | 1,071,500 |
| Nashville | 15,375,500 | 13,429,500 | 12,677,800 | 13,794,900 | 1,117,100 |
| Northeast | 12,442,600 | 11,051,400 | 10,605,000 | 11,924,900 | 1,319,900 |
| Pellissippi | 20,741,200 | 18,242,100 | 17,199,100 | 18,692,600 | 1,493,500 |
| Roane | 18,044,100 | 16,437,400 | 15,684,300 | 14,750,900 | $(933,400)$ |
| Southwest | 37,845,200 | 34,396,200 | 32,436,900 | 28,648,100 | $(3,788,800)$ |
| Volunteer | 18,134,900 | 16,269,400 | 15,389,800 | 15,281,400 | $(108,400)$ |
| Walters | 18,347,900 | 16,578,900 | 16,032,000 | 15,745,100 | $(286,900)$ |
| Subtotal | \$218,003,100 | \$195,906,400 | \$185,851,200 | \$185,017,000 | (\$834,200) |
| UT Universities |  |  |  |  |  |
| UT Chattanooga | \$42,102,800 | \$35,886,300 | \$33,463,400 | \$33,294,400 | (\$169,000) |
| UT Knoxville | 178,669,100 | 152,036,100 | 143,699,500 | 144,150,000 | 450,500 |
| UT Martin | 30,386,700 | 25,683,900 | 24,047,300 | 23,636,300 | $(411,000)$ |
| Subtotal | \$251,158,600 | \$213,606,300 | \$201,210,200 | \$201,080,700 | (\$129,500) |
| Total Colleges and Universities | \$848,595,600 | \$727,307,900 | \$685,726,500 | \$679,515,500 | $(\$ 6,211,000)$ |
| Technology Centers | \$50,825,800 | \$47,842,700 | \$46,263,500 | \$52,260,300 | \$5,996,800 |
| Total Academic Formula Units | \$899,421,400 | \$775,150,600 | \$731,990,000 | \$731,775,800 | (\$214,200) |

*Recurring; No ARRA or Maintenance of Effort Funds

## Table 1 <br> Tennessee Higher Education Commission

| Specialized Units | Total FY 2008-09 Appropriation* | Total FY 2009-10 <br> Appropriation* | Total FY 2010-11 <br> Appropriation* | Total FY 2011-12 <br> Appropriation* | $\begin{gathered} \text { FY 2011-12 } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Medical Education |  |  |  |  |  |
| ETSU College of Medicine | \$27,619,200 | \$26,297,600 | \$25,377,900 | \$25,859,200 | \$481,300 |
| ETSU Family Practice | 5,408,600 | 5,333,500 | 5,150,800 | 5,322,000 | 171,200 |
| UT College of Medicine | 46,573,700 | 44,057,000 | 42,524,700 | 42,820,200 | 295,500 |
| UT Family Practice | 9,654,000 | 9,487,500 | 9,187,200 | 9,313,200 | 126,000 |
| UT Memphis | 68,934,900 | 64,637,400 | 62,105,000 | 63,089,600 | 984,600 |
| UT College of Veterinary Medicine | 15,799,600 | 14,718,500 | 14,160,600 | 14,416,600 | 256,000 |
| Subtotal | \$173,990,000 | \$164,531,500 | \$158,506,200 | \$160,820,800 | \$2,314,600 |
| Research and Public Service |  |  |  |  |  |
| UT Agricultural Experiment Station | \$23,841,500 | \$23,377,800 | \$22,812,000 | \$23,111,900 | \$299,900 |
| UT Agricultural Extension Service | 28,694,300 | 28,143,100 | 27,416,300 | 27,825,100 | 408,800 |
| TSU McMinnville Center | 503,100 | 521,500 | 527,900 | 527,300 | (600) |
| TSU Institute of Agr and Environmental Research | 2,055,700 | 2,109,800 | 2,156,200 | 2,145,000 | $(11,200)$ |
| TSU Cooperative Education | 1,823,000 | 2,371,700 | 2,918,300 | 2,918,200 | (100) |
| TSU McIntire-Stennis Forestry Research | NA | 185,400 | 171,900 | 170,600 | $(1,300)$ |
| UT Space Institute | 7,821,000 | 7,465,900 | 7,212,500 | 7,276,600 | 64,100 |
| UT Institute for Public Service | 4,806,500 | 4,705,100 | 4,312,800 | 4,341,200 | 28,400 |
| UT County Tech Asstistance Service | 1,519,600 | 1,491,700 | 1,482,500 | 1,521,800 | 39,300 |
| UT Municipal Tech Advisory Service | 2,601,900 | 2,556,500 | 2,499,300 | 2,554,300 | 55,000 |
| Subtotal | \$73,666,600 | \$72,928,500 | \$71,509,700 | \$72,392,000 | \$882,300 |
| Other Specialized Units |  |  |  |  |  |
| UT University-Wide Administration | \$4,399,600 | \$4,353,700 | \$4,143,800 | \$4,209,000 | \$65,200 |
| TN Board of Regents Administration | 4,517,100 | 4,429,300 | 4,407,400 | 4,563,400 | 156,000 |
| TN Student Assistance Corporation | 48,712,900 | 48,589,500 | 48,567,100 | 48,579,200 | 12,100 |
| Tennessee Student Assistance Awards | 46,162,500 | 46,162,500 | 46,162,500 | 46,162,500 |  |
| Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation | 1,359,400 | 1,236,000 | 1,213,600 | 1,225,700 | 12,100 |
| Loan/Scholarships Program | 1,191,000 | 1,191,000 | 1,191,000 | 1,191,000 | - |
| TN Higher Education Commission | 2,207,300 | 2,186,500 | 2,160,300 | 2,224,500 | 64,200 |
| TN Foreign Language Institute | 369,000 | 349,100 | 338,100 | 352,800 | 14,700 |
| Contract Education | 2,490,700 | 2,289,700 | 2,217,000 | 2,198,200 | $(18,800)$ |
| Subtotal | \$62,696,600 | \$62,197,800 | \$61,833,700 | \$62,127,100 | \$293,400 |
| Total Specialized Units | \$310,353,200 | \$299,657,800 | \$291,849,600 | \$295,339,900 | \$3,490,300 |
| Total Formula and Specialized Units | \$1,209,774,600 | \$1,074,808,400 | \$1,023,839,600 | \$1,027,115,700 | \$3,276,100 |
| Program Initiatives |  |  |  |  |  |
| Campus Centers of Excellence | \$18,774,500 | \$17,717,700 | \$17,238,700 | \$17,328,000 | \$89,300 |
| Campus Centers of Emphasis | 1,344,900 | 1,269,200 | 1,240,700 | 1,247,600 | 6,900 |
| Ned McWherter Scholars Program | \$401,800 | 401,800 | 401,800 | 401,800 | - |
| UT Access and Diversity Initiative | \$6,181,900 | 5,833,900 | 5,648,700 | 5,600,600 | $(48,100)$ |
| TBR Access and Diversity Initiative | 10,543,000 | 10,313,200 | 9,977,400 | 9,892,900 | $(84,500)$ |
| THEC Grants | \$2,581,800 | 2,436,500 | 2,359,200 | 2,339,200 | $(20,000)$ |
| Research Initiatives - UT | 6,231,000 | 5,880,300 | 5,693,700 | 5,645,200 | $(48,500)$ |
| Subtotal | \$46,058,900 | \$43,852,600 | \$42,560,200 | \$42,455,300 | (\$104,900) |
| Total Operating | \$1,255,833,500 | \$1,118,661,000 | \$1,066,399,800 | \$1,069,571,000 | \$3,171,200 |

*Recurring; No ARRA or Maintenance of Effort Funds

| Total Operating | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 5 5 , 8 3 3 , 5 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 1 8 , 6 6 1 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 6 6 , 3 9 9 , 8 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 6 9 , 5 7 1 , 0 0 0}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lottery for Education Account | $\mathbf{\$ 2 9 5 , 2 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 8 9 , 1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 2 9 5 , 7 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 3 0 1 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
| GRAND TOTAL | $\$ 1,551,033,500$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 4 0 7 , 7 6 1 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 6 2 , 0 9 9 , 8 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 3 7 0 , 5 7 1 , 0 0 0}$ |

Table 1 (continued)
Total Formula Need Funding

| Institution/Unit | FY 2011-12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Formula EstimatedTotal Need |  | Difference |  | Percent Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Recurring Legislative Appropriation |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Maintenance } \\ \text { Fees } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Technology Access Fee |  | Out-of-State Tuition |  | Total Revenue |  |  |  |  |  |
| Austin Peay | \$ | 26,107,600 | \$ | 55,214,500 | \$ | 2,426,000 | \$ | 3,069,800 | \$ | 86,817,900 | \$ | 85,496,100 | \$ | 1,321,800 | 101.5\% |
| East Tennessee |  | 44,000,700 |  | 78,439,900 |  | 3,165,000 |  | 10,442,300 |  | 136,047,900 |  | 151,879,100 |  | $(15,831,200)$ | 89.6\% |
| Middle Tennessee |  | 73,423,800 |  | 139,529,100 |  | 5,300,000 |  | 12,524,100 |  | 230,777,000 |  | 235,811,600 |  | $(5,034,600)$ | 97.9\% |
| Tennessee State |  | 29,335,100 |  | 46,389,000 |  | 1,855,000 |  | 17,500,000 |  | 95,079,100 |  | 111,287,600 |  | $(16,208,500)$ | 85.4\% |
| Tennessee Tech |  | 35,086,300 |  | 56,898,500 |  | 2,297,800 |  | 6,400,000 |  | 100,682,600 |  | 113,282,400 |  | $(12,599,800)$ | 88.9\% |
| University of Memphis |  | 85,464,300 |  | 135,970,800 |  | 4,262,700 |  | 10,771,400 |  | 236,469,200 |  | 283,034,700 |  | $(46,565,500)$ | 83.5\% |
| Subtotal TBR Universities | \$ | 293,417,800 | \$ | 512,441,800 | \$ | 19,306,500 | \$ | 60,707,600 | \$ | 885,873,700 | \$ | 980,791,500 | \$ | $(94,917,800)$ | 90.3\% |
| Chattanooga | \$ | 19,970,200 | \$ | 28,250,000 | \$ | 1,950,000 | \$ | 625,000 | \$ | 50,795,200 | \$ | 51,604,000 |  | $(808,800)$ | 98.4\% |
| Cleveland |  | 8,421,200 |  | 9,841,900 |  | 760,000 |  | 230,500 |  | 19,253,600 |  | 21,422,100 |  | $(2,168,500)$ | 89.9\% |
| Columbia |  | 11,121,800 |  | 12,835,700 |  | 916,000 |  | 295,700 |  | 25,169,200 |  | 28,664,300 |  | $(3,495,100)$ | 87.8\% |
| Dyersburg |  | 6,484,500 |  | 8,533,200 |  | 766,600 |  | 94,900 |  | 15,879,200 |  | 17,074,800 |  | $(1,195,600)$ | 93.0\% |
| Jackson |  | 10,518,500 |  | 13,311,200 |  | 869,700 |  | 109,600 |  | 24,809,000 |  | 27,561,100 |  | $(2,752,100)$ | 90.0\% |
| Motlow |  | 9,662,900 |  | 11,683,500 |  | 802,600 |  | 230,000 |  | 22,379,000 |  | 26,849,200 |  | $(4,470,200)$ | 83.4\% |
| Nashville |  | 13,794,900 |  | 23,000,000 |  | 1,600,000 |  | 810,400 |  | 39,205,300 |  | 38,185,200 |  | 1,020,100 | 102.7\% |
| Northeast |  | 11,924,900 |  | 16,997,100 |  | 1,200,000 |  | 61,700 |  | 30,183,700 |  | 32,055,600 |  | $(1,871,900)$ | 94.2\% |
| Pellissippi |  | 18,692,600 |  | 29,830,000 |  | 2,400,000 |  | 1,230,000 |  | 52,152,600 |  | 51,069,600 |  | 1,083,000 | 102.1\% |
| Roane |  | 14,750,900 |  | 16,677,100 |  | 1,324,100 |  | 411,800 |  | 33,163,900 |  | 36,262,500 |  | $(3,098,600)$ | 91.5\% |
| Southwest |  | 28,648,100 |  | 34,496,900 |  | 3,251,000 |  | 1,368,000 |  | 67,764,000 |  | 66,214,700 |  | 1,549,300 | 102.3\% |
| Volunteer |  | 15,281,400 |  | 20,133,500 |  | 1,385,700 |  | 595,800 |  | 37,396,400 |  | 38,986,400 |  | $(1,590,000)$ | 95.9\% |
| Walters |  | 15,745,100 |  | 18,664,900 |  | 1,322,500 |  | 366,200 |  | 36,098,700 |  | 40,666,500 |  | $(4,567,800)$ | 88.8\% |
| Subtotal 2-Year Institutions | \$ | 185,017,000 | \$ | 244,255,000 | \$ | 18,548,200 | \$ | 6,429,600 | \$ | 454,249,800 | \$ | 476,616,000 | \$ | $(22,366,200)$ | 95.3\% |
| UT Chattanooga | \$ | 33,294,400 | \$ | 53,712,300 | \$ | 1,540,900 | \$ | 6,783,000 | \$ | 95,330,600 | \$ | 109,628,200 |  | $(14,297,600)$ | 87.0\% |
| UT Knoxville |  | 144,150,000 |  | 197,618,400 |  | 5,200,000 |  | 36,439,500 |  | 383,407,900 |  | 497,625,400 |  | $(114,217,500)$ | 77.0\% |
| UT Martin |  | 23,636,300 |  | 42,385,400 |  | 1,342,000 |  | 3,874,100 |  | 71,237,800 |  | 73,758,600 |  | $(2,520,800)$ | 96.6\% |
| Subtotal UT Universities | \$ | 201,080,700 | \$ | 293,716,100 | \$ | 8,082,900 | \$ | 47,096,600 | \$ | 549,976,300 | \$ | 681,012,200 | \$ | $(131,035,900)$ | 80.8\% |
| Technology Centers | \$ | 52,260,300 | \$ | 24,659,800 | \$ | 1,972,200 | \$ | - | \$ | 78,892,300 |  | \$120,451,000 | \$ | $(41,558,700)$ | 65.5\% |
| Total Formula Units | \$ | 731,775,800 | \$ | 1,075,072,700 | \$ | 47,909,800 | \$ | 114,233,800 | \$ | 1,968,992,100 | \$ | 2,258,870,700 | \$ | $(289,878,600)$ | 87.2\% |

Table 2
SUMMARY OF UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL REVENUE DOLLARS AND PERCENT BY SOURCE FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS, JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total TBR |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | APSU | ETSU | MTSU | TSU | TTU | UM | Universities | Chattanooga | Cleveland |
| Tuition \& Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$67,739,500 | \$100,669,200 | \$167,689,800 | \$67,031,900 | \$69,429,800 | \$163,159,700 | \$635,719,900 | \$33,946,500 | \$11,226,400 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 68.88\% | 62.23\% | 65.32\% | 65.09\% | 61.38\% | 51.53\% | 60.57\% | 61.41\% | 55.18\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$70,343,500 | \$102,808,400 | \$176,654,000 | \$70,878,400 | \$73,190,500 | \$171,223,000 | \$665,097,800 | \$34,048,400 | \$11,495,900 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 69.69\% | 63.08\% | 66.43\% | 66.26\% | 62.47\% | 53.99\% | 62.09\% | 61.45\% | 55.74\% |
| State Appropriation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$26,265,200 | \$45,971,500 | \$73,470,300 | \$28,527,600 | \$35,454,800 | \$102,275,000 | \$311,964,400 | \$20,471,300 | \$8,987,800 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 26.71\% | 28.42\% | 28.62\% | 27.70\% | 31.34\% | 32.30\% | 29.72\% | 37.03\% | 44.18\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$26,317,000 | \$46,007,500 | \$73,560,700 | \$28,535,200 | \$35,459,600 | \$92,332,400 | \$302,212,400 | \$20,486,400 | \$8,997,200 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 26.07\% | 28.23\% | 27.66\% | 26.68\% | 30.26\% | 29.11\% | 28.21\% | 36.97\% | 43.62\% |
| Sales 80 Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$3,485,600 | \$6,543,800 | \$12,645,200 | \$4,255,000 | \$6,059,800 | \$25,522,800 | \$58,512,200 | \$323,400 | \$12,200 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 3.54\% | 4.05\% | 4.93\% | 4.13\% | 5.36\% | 8.06\% | 5.57\% | 0.59\% | 0.06\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$3,485,600 | \$6,770,300 | \$12,745,900 | \$4,405,000 | \$6,342,300 | \$26,745,700 | \$60,494,800 | \$323,400 | \$12,200 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 3.45\% | 4.15\% | 4.79\% | 4.12\% | 5.41\% | 8.43\% | 5.65\% | 0.58\% | 0.06\% |
| Other Sources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$852,100 | \$8,584,800 | \$2,906,800 | \$3,169,600 | \$2,174,500 | \$25,666,900 | \$43,354,700 | \$538,600 | \$119,300 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.87\% | 5.31\% | 1.13\% | 3.08\% | 1.92\% | 8.11\% | 4.13\% | 0.97\% | 0.59\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$787,000 | \$7,400,600 | \$2,981,000 | \$3,149,600 | \$2,173,100 | \$26,832,400 | \$43,323,700 | \$549,800 | \$120,300 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.78\% | 4.54\% | 1.12\% | 2.94\% | 1.85\% | 8.46\% | 4.04\% | 0.99\% | 0.58\% |
| Total Educ. \& $^{\text {c Gen. }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$98,342,400 | \$161,769,300 | \$256,712,100 | \$102,984,100 | \$113,118,900 | \$316,624,400 | \$1,049,551,200 | \$55,279,800 | \$20,345,700 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$100,933,100 | \$162,986,800 | \$265,941,600 | \$106,968,200 | \$117,165,500 | \$317,133,500 | \$1,071,128,700 | \$55,408,000 | \$20,625,600 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

## SUMMARY OF UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL REVENUE DOLLARS AND PERCENT BY SOURCE FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS, JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12

|  | Columbia | Dyersburg | Jackson | Motlow | Nashville | Northeast | Pellissippi | Roane | Southwest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuition \& Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$16,060,900 | \$10,109,300 | \$14,420,700 | \$13,855,600 | \$25,169,400 | \$19,763,900 | \$35,316,000 | \$20,657,400 | \$39,204,500 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 57.93\% | 59.86\% | 56.24\% | 58.41\% | 62.44\% | 60.88\% | 63.64\% | 55.75\% | 53.88\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$14,954,000 | \$10,161,300 | \$14,843,300 | \$13,337,700 | \$26,091,800 | \$18,819,000 | \$36,246,000 | \$20,424,000 | \$41,718,500 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 56.17\% | 59.99\% | 57.08\% | 57.39\% | 63.29\% | 59.68\% | 64.30\% | 55.51\% | 55.41\% |
| State Appropriation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$11,409,100 | \$6,549,400 | \$10,613,200 | \$9,712,100 | \$13,888,800 | \$12,033,000 | \$18,842,800 | \$15,505,900 | \$32,273,900 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 41.15\% | 38.78\% | 41.39\% | 40.94\% | $34.46 \%$ | 37.07\% | 33.95\% | 41.85\% | 44.35\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$11,420,500 | \$6,546,800 | \$10,606,300 | \$9,733,200 | \$13,903,100 | \$12,045,100 | \$18,855,700 | \$15,524,200 | \$32,282,100 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 42.90\% | 38.65\% | 40.78\% | 41.88\% | 33.72\% | 38.20\% | 33.45\% | 42.19\% | 42.88\% |
| Sales \& Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$42,000 | \$7,900 | \$97,600 | \$0 | \$4,100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$17,300 | \$13,400 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.15\% | 0.05\% | 0.38\% | 0.00\% | 0.01\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.05\% | 0.02\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$42,000 | \$7,900 | \$97,600 | \$0 | \$4,100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$17,700 | \$13,400 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.16\% | 0.05\% | 0.38\% | 0.00\% | 0.01\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.05\% | 0.02\% |
| Other Sources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$211,900 | \$220,900 | \$509,900 | \$154,000 | \$1,247,100 | \$667,100 | \$1,336,000 | \$871,600 | \$1,271,000 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.76\% | 1.31\% | 1.99\% | 0.65\% | 3.09\% | 2.05\% | 2.41\% | 2.35\% | 1.75\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$207,000 | \$223,100 | \$459,100 | \$168,300 | \$1,229,600 | \$667,200 | \$1,266,300 | \$828,300 | \$1,271,200 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.78\% | 1.32\% | 1.77\% | 0.72\% | 2.98\% | 2.12\% | 2.25\% | 2.25\% | 1.69\% |
| Total Educ. \&\% Gen. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$27,723,900 | \$16,887,500 | \$25,641,400 | \$23,721,700 | \$40,309,400 | \$32,464,000 | \$55,494,800 | \$37,052,200 | \$72,762,800 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$26,623,500 | \$16,939,100 | \$26,006,300 | \$23,239,200 | \$41,228,600 | \$31,531,300 | \$56,368,000 | \$36,794,200 | \$75,285,200 |
| Oct 31-Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

## SUMMARY OF UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL REVENUE DOLLARS AND PERCENT BY SOURCE

 FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS, JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12|  | Volunteer | Walters | Total <br> Two-Year Institutions | Total Technology Centers | ETSU College of Medicine |  | ETSU <br> Pharmacy <br> School | Tennessee Board of Regents Admin | TSU <br> McMinnville <br> Center |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuition \& Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$25,352,500 | \$22,943,700 | \$288,026,800 | \$27,404,500 | \$8,595,100 | \$0 | \$9,342,100 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 61.21\% | 57.60\% | 58.91\% | 34.64\% | 16.71\% | 0.00\% | 92.18\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$24,320,500 | \$22,561,700 | \$289,022,100 | \$27,725,600 | \$8,659,500 | \$0 | \$9,517,700 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31-Percent | 60.21\% | 57.16\% | 58.99\% | 34.91\% | 16.81\% | 0.00\% | 76.44\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| State Appropriation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$15,495,500 | \$15,947,300 | \$191,730,100 | \$48,479,500 | \$25,984,000 | \$5,353,900 | \$0 | \$8,603,800 | \$528,800 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 37.41\% | 40.04\% | 39.21\% | 61.27\% | 50.52\% | 38.57\% | 0.00\% | 35.31\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$15,507,500 | \$15,968,900 | \$191,877,000 | \$48,564,500 | \$25,971,900 | \$5,351,400 | \$0 | \$8,603,800 | \$528,800 |
| Oct 31-Percent | 38.39\% | 40.46\% | 39.17\% | 61.15\% | 50.43\% | 39.22\% | 0.00\% | 34.23\% | 100.00\% |
| Sales \& Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$19,000 | \$141,900 | \$678,800 | \$579,000 | \$15,214,600 | \$7,975,600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.05\% | 0.36\% | 0.14\% | 0.73\% | 29.58\% | 57.46\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$19,000 | \$142,900 | \$680,200 | \$581,200 | \$15,214,100 | \$7,812,600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.05\% | 0.36\% | 0.14\% | 0.73\% | 29.54\% | 57.26\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Other Sources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$553,000 | \$798,300 | \$8,498,700 | \$2,657,700 | \$1,640,100 | \$550,500 | \$793,000 | \$15,761,900 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 1.34\% | 2.00\% | 1.74\% | 3.36\% | 3.19\% | 3.97\% | 7.82\% | 64.69\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$547,900 | \$798,500 | \$8,336,600 | \$2,549,300 | \$1,658,100 | \$480,800 | \$2,933,800 | \$16,528,700 | \$0 |
| Oct 31-Percent | 1.36\% | 2.02\% | 1.70\% | $3.21 \%$ | 3.22\% | 3.52\% | 23.56\% | 65.77\% | 0.00\% |
| Total Educ. \& Gen. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$41,420,000 | \$39,831,200 | \$488,934,400 | \$79,120,700 | \$51,433,800 | \$13,880,000 | \$10,135,100 | \$24,365,700 | \$528,800 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$40,394,900 | \$39,472,000 | \$489,915,900 | \$79,420,600 | \$51,503,600 | \$13,644,800 | \$12,451,500 | \$25,132,500 | \$528,800 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

## SUMMARY OF UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL REVENUE DOLLARS AND PERCENT BY SOURCE FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS, JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12

|  | TSU McIntire-Stennis | TSU <br> Institute of Agriculture | TSU <br> Cooperative <br> Education | Sub-Total TBR System | UTC | UTK | UTM | Total UT <br> Formula Universities | UT Space Institute |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuition \& Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$969,088,400 | \$70,850,200 | \$287,873,000 | \$52,730,600 | \$411,453,700 | \$1,848,500 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 56.24\% | 63.26\% | 60.16\% | 64.10\% | 61.16\% | 18.40\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,000,022,700 | \$72,474,900 | \$288,388,900 | \$52,853,600 | \$413,717,400 | \$1,848,500 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 57.18\% | 63.33\% | 60.02\% | 63.83\% | 61.05\% | 18.37\% |
| State Appropriation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$170,600 | \$2,145,700 | \$2,917,000 | \$597,877,800 | \$34,563,800 | \$147,872,000 | \$25,024,500 | \$207,460,300 | \$7,373,700 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 34.70\% | 30.86\% | 30.90\% | 30.42\% | 30.84\% | 73.40\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$170,600 | \$2,145,000 | \$2,918,200 | \$588,343,600 | \$35,050,100 | \$148,018,700 | \$25,217,900 | \$208,286,800 | \$7,391,300 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 33.64\% | 30.63\% | 30.81\% | 30.45\% | 30.73\% | 73.44\% |
| Sales \& Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$82,960,200 | \$4,076,300 | \$7,823,600 | \$2,611,600 | \$14,511,500 | \$25,000 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.81\% | 3.64\% | 1.64\% | 3.17\% | 2.16\% | 0.25\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$84,782,900 | \$4,268,100 | \$7,838,600 | \$2,836,400 | \$14,943,100 | \$25,000 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.85\% | 3.73\% | 1.63\% | 3.43\% | 2.20\% | 0.25\% |
| Other Sources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$73,256,600 | \$2,500,400 | \$34,931,700 | \$1,899,300 | \$39,331,400 | \$799,400 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.25\% | 2.23\% | 7.30\% | 2.31\% | 5.85\% | 7.96\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$75,811,000 | \$2,642,300 | \$36,231,700 | \$1,899,300 | \$40,773,300 | \$799,400 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.33\% | 2.31\% | 7.54\% | 2.29\% | 6.02\% | 7.94\% |
| Total Educ. \%\% Gen. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$170,600 | \$2,145,700 | \$2,917,000 | \$1,723,183,000 | \$111,990,700 | \$478,500,200 | \$82,266,000 | \$672,756,900 | \$10,046,600 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$170,600 | \$2,145,000 | \$2,918,200 | \$1,748,960,200 | \$114,435,500 | \$480,477,800 | \$82,807,300 | \$677,720,500 | \$10,064,200 |
| Oct 31-Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

# SUMMARY OF UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL REVENUE DOLLARS AND PERCENT BY SOURCE FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS, JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12 

|  | UT <br> Memphis | UT College of Medicine | UT Family Medicine | Agricultural <br> Experiment Station | Agricultural <br> Extension <br> Service | College of Veterinary Medicine | Institute <br> for Public Service | MTAS | CTAS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tuition 8\% Fees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$43,332,500 | \$21,515,600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,241,600 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 32.49\% | 30.25\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 27.68\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$43,344,800 | \$21,515,600 | \$0 | \$0 |  | \$10,488,200 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | $32.40 \%$ | 29.86\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 28.16\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| State Appropriation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$64,525,000 | \$43,326,000 | \$9,483,400 | \$23,299,900 | \$28,071,000 | \$14,822,400 | \$4,368,800 | \$2,571,500 | \$1,536,000 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 48.39\% | 60.91\% | 48.28\% | 66.21\% | 66.42\% | 40.06\% | 76.98\% | 46.59\% | 33.50\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$64,830,400 | \$44,093,800 | \$9,386,300 | \$23,333,800 | \$28,160,400 | \$14,823,600 | \$4,368,600 | \$2,571,300 | \$1,535,000 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 48.46\% | 61.20\% | 47.99\% | 65.15\% | 66.49\% | 39.79\% | 76.74\% | 46.59\% | 33.86\% |
| Sales \& Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$7,448,500 | \$1,551,900 | \$9,365,800 | \$3,410,400 | \$3,960,900 | \$10,241,900 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 5.59\% | 2.18\% | 47.69\% | 9.69\% | 9.37\% | 27.68\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$7,540,600 | \$1,696,400 | \$9,380,600 | \$3,410,400 | \$3,960,900 | \$10,245,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 5.64\% | 2.35\% | 47.96\% | 9.52\% | 9.35\% | 27.50\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Other Sources |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$18,048,600 | \$4,740,200 | \$791,800 | \$8,481,100 | \$10,228,500 | \$1,693,900 | \$1,306,100 | \$2,947,900 | \$3,048,800 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 13.53\% | 6.66\% | 4.03\% | 24.10\% | 24.20\% | 4.58\% | 23.02\% | 53.41\% | 66.50\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$18,062,300 | \$4,742,200 | \$791,800 | \$9,071,700 | \$10,228,500 | \$1,693,900 | \$1,324,100 | \$2,947,900 | \$2,998,800 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 13.50\% | 6.58\% | 4.05\% | 25.33\% | 24.15\% | 4.55\% | 23.26\% | 53.41\% | 66.14\% |
| Total Educ. \& Gen. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$133,354,600 | \$71,133,800 | \$19,641,000 | \$35,191,400 | \$42,260,400 | \$36,999,800 | \$5,674,900 | \$5,519,400 | \$4,584,800 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31-Dollar | \$133,778,100 | \$72,048,000 | \$19,558,700 | \$35,815,900 | \$42,349,800 | \$37,250,700 | \$5,692,700 | \$5,519,200 | \$4,533,800 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

# SUMMARY OF UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL REVENUE DOLLARS AND PERCENT BY SOURCE 

 FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS, JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12

SUMMARY OF PERCENT UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTIONAL AREA BY INSTITUTION FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12

Instruction
Jul 1 - D
Jul 1 - P
Oct 31 -
Oct 31 -
Research
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Percent
Public Service
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Percent
Academic Support Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Percent

SubTotal
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Percent

## Jul 1 - Dollar <br> Jul 1 - Percen <br> Oct 31 - Dolla <br> Oct 31 - Percent

Institutional Support
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Percent
Operation \& Maintenanc
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar

Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Percent
Scholarships $8_{8}$ Fellowships
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Percent

| APSU | ETSU | MTSU | TSU | TTU | UM | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { TBR } \\ \text { Universities } \end{gathered}$ | Chattanooga | Cleveland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$48,322,800 | \$79,952,800 | \$123,455,100 | \$48,768,500 | \$50,894,400 | \$134,317,500 | \$485,711,100 | \$30,385,400 | \$9,273,500 |
| 49.53\% | 50.10\% | 50.57\% | 47.58\% | 47.29\% | 43.13\% | 47.49\% | 54.57\% | 45.23\% |
| \$49,860,600 | \$86,353,200 | \$144,676,000 | \$51,286,600 | \$55,405,600 | \$154,315,300 | \$541,897,300 | \$30,373,300 | \$9,970,100 |
| 49.85\% | 50.66\% | 51.38\% | 47.11\% | 46.20\% | 43.31\% | 47.65\% | 53.72\% | 44.57\% |
| \$460,400 | \$2,642,500 | \$5,159,100 | \$1,562,000 | \$1,388,400 | \$22,065,900 | \$33,278,300 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 0.47\% | 1.66\% | 2.11\% | 1.52\% | 1.29\% | 7.09\% | 3.25\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| \$586,600 | \$4,529,900 | \$9,293,200 | \$1,554,600 | \$2,274,400 | \$23,321,900 | \$41,560,600 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 0.59\% | 2.66\% | 3.30\% | 1.43\% | 1.90\% | 6.55\% | 3.65\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| \$350,800 | \$1,986,500 | \$3,298,300 | \$631,300 | \$1,813,900 | \$6,200,600 | \$14,281,400 | \$85,300 | \$152,500 |
| 0.36\% | 1.24\% | 1.35\% | 0.62\% | 1.69\% | 1.99\% | 1.40\% | 0.15\% | 0.74\% |
| \$274,400 | \$2,351,000 | \$4,246,200 | \$661,800 | \$2,185,800 | \$7,895,700 | \$17,614,900 | \$75,000 | \$251,100 |
| 0.27\% | 1.38\% | 1.51\% | 0.61\% | 1.82\% | 2.22\% | 1.55\% | 0.13\% | 1.12\% |
| \$6,702,800 | \$17,309,100 | \$22,205,500 | \$9,691,600 | \$8,917,300 | \$26,605,800 | \$91,432,100 | \$4,619,200 | \$1,493,300 |
| 6.87\% | 10.85\% | 9.10\% | 9.46\% | 8.29\% | 8.54\% | 8.94\% | 8.30\% | 7.28\% |
| \$6,762,800 | \$17,764,600 | \$23,781,300 | \$9,821,200 | \$10,533,500 | \$30,614,100 | \$99,277,500 | \$4,892,700 | \$1,485,000 |
| 6.76\% | 10.42\% | 8.45\% | 9.02\% | 8.78\% | 8.59\% | 8.73\% | 8.65\% | 6.64\% |
| \$55,836,800 | \$101,890,900 | \$154,118,000 | \$60,653,400 | \$63,014,000 | \$189,189,800 | \$624,702,900 | \$35,089,900 | \$10,919,300 |
| 57.23\% | 63.85\% | 63.12\% | 59.17\% | 58.56\% | 60.75\% | 61.08\% | 63.02\% | 53.25\% |
| \$57,484,400 | \$110,998,700 | \$181,996,700 | \$63,324,200 | \$70,399,300 | \$216,147,000 | \$700,350,300 | \$35,341,000 | \$11,706,200 |
| 57.47\% | 65.12\% | 64.63\% | 58.17\% | 58.71\% | 60.67\% | 61.59\% | 62.50\% | 52.33\% |
| \$17,497,400 | \$19,444,100 | \$36,829,100 | \$15,717,300 | \$16,597,000 | \$54,831,300 | \$160,916,200 | \$6,485,200 | \$3,476,200 |
| 17.93\% | 12.18\% | 15.08\% | 15.33\% | 15.42\% | 17.61\% | 15.73\% | 11.65\% | 16.95\% |
| \$17,759,500 | \$20,033,200 | \$40,069,200 | \$16,282,300 | \$18,290,300 | \$59,156,800 | \$171,591,300 | \$6,634,900 | \$3,334,000 |
| 17.76\% | 11.75\% | 14.23\% | 14.96\% | 15.25\% | 16.60\% | 15.09\% | 11.73\% | 14.90\% |

Total Educational \& General Expenditures
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Percent
100
$\$ 13,601,800$
$8.52 \%$
$\$ 14,120,000$
$8.28 \%$
$\$ 22,761,600$
$9.32 \%$
$\$ 26,258,300$
$9.32 \%$
$\$ 12,695,400$
$12.39 \%$
$\$ 13,791,100$
$12.67 \%$
$\$ 10,422,500$
$9.69 \%$
$\$ 11,482,100$
$9.58 \%$

| $\$ 28,559,800$ | $\$ 98,202,200$ | $\$ 7,976,100$ | $\$ 3,323,100$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $9.17 \%$ | $9.60 \%$ | $14.32 \%$ | $16.21 \%$ |
| $\$ 33,210,600$ | $\$ 109,328,800$ | $\$ 8,202,000$ | $\$ 4,168,800$ |
| $9.32 \%$ | $9.61 \%$ | $14.51 \%$ | $18.64 \%$ |

$\$ 13,821,300 \quad \$ 18,665,400$
$\begin{array}{rr}\$ 8,944,600 & \$ 11,1 \\ 8.73 \% & \\ \$ 10,234,600 & \$ 12 \\ 9.40 \% & \end{array}$
$\$ 11,1$
1
$\$ 12,467$
10
$\$ 11,167,700$
$10.38 \%$
$\$ 12,467,300$
$10.40 \%$

| $\$ 26,707,000$ | $\$ 88,066,800$ | $\$ 5,261,500$ | $\$ 2,262,800$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $8.58 \%$ | $8.61 \%$ | $9.45 \%$ | $11.04 \%$ |
| $\$ 33,797,400$ | $\$ 99,247,700$ | $\$ 5,438,800$ | $\$ 2,526,600$ |
| $9.49 \%$ | $8.73 \%$ | $9.62 \%$ | $11.29 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 12,132,000$ | $\$ 50,938,400$ | $\$ 868,600$ | $\$ 523,200$ |
| $3.90 \%$ | $4.98 \%$ | $1.56 \%$ | $2.55 \%$ |
| $\$ 13,963,200$ | $\$ 56,608,700$ | $\$ 925,000$ | $\$ 634,300$ |
| $3.92 \%$ | $4.98 \%$ | $1.64 \%$ | $2.84 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 311,419,900$ | $\$ 1,022,826,500$ | $\$ 55,681,300$ | $\$ 20,504,600$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |
| $\$ 356,275,000$ | $\$ 1,137,126,800$ | $\$ 56,541,700$ | $\$ 22,369,900$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |


|  | Columbia | Dyersburg | Jackson | Motlow | Nashville | Northeast | Pellissippi | Roane | Southwest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instruction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$14,571,100 | \$8,733,100 | \$13,385,800 | \$11,111,800 | \$24,170,700 | \$18,894,400 | \$30,567,400 | \$19,078,200 | \$37,368,700 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 54.86\% | 54.21\% | 54.58\% | 48.97\% | 56.85\% | 54.09\% | 55.14\% | 54.40\% | 48.82\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$14,629,300 | \$9,289,500 | \$14,007,400 | \$11,413,800 | \$24,310,200 | \$18,815,300 | \$31,867,900 | \$19,115,600 | \$36,001,200 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 54.70\% | 54.48\% | 53.70\% | 48.54\% | 56.25\% | 52.67\% | 55.06\% | 52.91\% | 46.82\% |
| Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Public Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$92,000 | \$47,500 | \$52,100 | \$102,200 | \$513,800 | \$33,900 | \$573,000 | \$566,200 | \$98,600 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.35\% | 0.29\% | 0.21\% | 0.45\% | 1.21\% | 0.10\% | 1.03\% | 1.61\% | 0.13\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$92,200 | \$47,500 | \$54,100 | \$105,400 | \$517,600 | \$183,900 | \$464,400 | \$612,000 | \$201,500 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.34\% | 0.28\% | 0.21\% | 0.45\% | 1.20\% | 0.51\% | 0.80\% | 1.69\% | 0.26\% |
| Academic Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$1,763,900 | \$706,300 | \$1,449,400 | \$2,211,200 | \$3,854,600 | \$3,413,200 | \$5,682,100 | \$1,914,300 | \$10,440,900 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 6.64\% | 4.38\% | 5.91\% | 9.75\% | 9.07\% | 9.77\% | 10.25\% | 5.46\% | 13.64\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$1,570,400 | \$783,800 | \$1,507,500 | \$2,157,400 | \$4,081,600 | \$3,510,600 | \$6,329,700 | \$2,056,100 | \$10,720,600 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 5.87\% | 4.60\% | 5.78\% | 9.18\% | 9.44\% | 9.83\% | 10.94\% | 5.69\% | 13.94\% |
| SubTotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$16,427,000 | \$9,486,900 | \$14,887,300 | \$13,425,200 | \$28,539,100 | \$22,341,500 | \$36,822,500 | \$21,558,700 | \$47,908,200 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 61.85\% | 58.89\% | 60.70\% | 59.17\% | 67.12\% | 63.95\% | 66.42\% | 61.47\% | 62.60\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$16,291,900 | \$10,120,800 | \$15,569,000 | \$13,676,600 | \$28,909,400 | \$22,509,800 | \$38,662,000 | \$21,783,700 | \$46,923,300 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 60.91\% | 59.35\% | 59.69\% | 58.17\% | 66.89\% | 63.02\% | 66.80\% | 60.30\% | 61.03\% |
| Student Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$3,353,400 | \$1,996,900 | \$2,628,300 | \$2,784,100 | \$3,110,900 | \$4,237,000 | \$5,971,200 | \$4,136,600 | \$8,509,100 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 12.63\% | 12.40\% | 10.72\% | 12.27\% | 7.32\% | 12.13\% | 10.77\% | 11.79\% | 11.12\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$3,475,400 | \$2,004,900 | \$2,691,000 | \$3,239,800 | \$3,211,700 | \$3,827,400 | \$6,263,500 | \$4,417,500 | \$8,532,400 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 12.99\% | 11.76\% | 10.32\% | 13.78\% | 7.43\% | 10.71\% | 10.82\% | 12.23\% | 11.10\% |
| Institutional Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$3,894,100 | \$2,740,600 | \$4,136,100 | \$3,747,500 | \$5,216,500 | \$4,146,700 | \$7,208,300 | \$4,931,400 | \$11,206,900 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 14.66\% | 17.01\% | 16.86\% | 16.52\% | 12.27\% | 11.87\% | 13.00\% | 14.06\% | 14.64\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$4,018,700 | \$2,845,000 | \$4,430,200 | \$3,727,500 | \$5,387,400 | \$4,920,600 | \$7,313,900 | \$5,135,600 | \$13,104,800 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 15.03\% | 16.68\% | 16.99\% | 15.85\% | 12.46\% | 13.78\% | 12.64\% | 14.22\% | 17.04\% |
| Operation \&\% Maintenance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$2,643,500 | \$1,736,900 | \$2,253,300 | \$2,251,300 | \$5,181,900 | \$4,020,900 | \$4,218,000 | \$3,834,500 | \$7,095,300 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 9.95\% | 10.78\% | 9.19\% | 9.92\% | 12.19\% | 11.51\% | 7.61\% | 10.93\% | 9.27\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$2,630,000 | \$1,767,900 | \$2,760,500 | \$2,374,200 | \$5,242,500 | \$4,254,300 | \$4,329,700 | \$4,057,900 | \$6,513,600 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 9.83\% | 10.37\% | 10.58\% | 10.10\% | 12.13\% | 11.91\% | 7.48\% | 11.23\% | 8.47\% |
| Scholarships \& Fellowships |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$241,000 | \$147,800 | \$620,800 | \$480,900 | \$469,100 | \$188,000 | \$1,221,000 | \$611,100 | \$1,817,000 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.91\% | 0.92\% | 2.53\% | 2.12\% | 1.10\% | 0.54\% | 2.20\% | 1.74\% | 2.37\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$330,000 | \$313,200 | \$631,800 | \$493,900 | \$470,800 | \$208,000 | \$1,305,500 | \$732,100 | \$1,817,000 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 1.23\% | 1.84\% | 2.42\% | 2.10\% | 1.09\% | 0.58\% | 2.26\% | 2.03\% | 2.36\% |
| Total Educational \& General Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$26,559,000 | \$16,109,100 | \$24,525,800 | \$22,689,000 | \$42,517,500 | \$34,934,100 | \$55,441,000 | \$35,072,300 | \$76,536,500 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$26,746,000 | \$17,051,800 | \$26,082,500 | \$23,512,000 | \$43,221,800 | \$35,720,100 | \$57,874,600 | \$36,126,800 | \$76,891,100 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

SUMMARY OF PERCENT UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTIONAL AREA BY INSTITUTION FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS

JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12
Instruction
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Percent

| Volunteer | Walters | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { Two-Year } \\ \text { Institutions } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { Technology } \\ & \text { Centers } \end{aligned}$ | ETSU College of Medicine | ETSU Family Practice | ETSU Pharmacy <br> School | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tennessee } \\ \text { Board of } \\ \text { Regents Admin } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { McMinnville } \\ \text { Center }}}{\text { TSU }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$21,761,800 | \$22,017,700 | \$261,319,600 | \$48,965,600 | \$35,243,000 | \$9,351,900 | \$6,030,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 55.07\% | 54.26\% | 53.26\% | 60.10\% | 67.14\% | 68.68\% | 63.67\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| \$22,242,400 | \$23,495,600 | \$265,531,600 | \$51,657,000 | \$36,242,500 | \$9,519,600 | \$6,153,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 55.28\% | 53.68\% | 52.46\% | 60.24\% | 67.06\% | 68.93\% | 62.76\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,385,800 | \$357,900 | \$919,700 | \$0 | \$527,500 |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 6.45\% | 2.63\% | 9.71\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,712,800 | \$348,100 | \$1,002,900 | \$0 | \$739,100 |
| 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 6.87\% | 2.52\% | 10.23\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% |
| \$274,900 | \$462,700 | \$3,054,700 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 0.70\% | 1.14\% | 0.62\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| \$250,000 | \$520,800 | \$3,375,500 | \$500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 0.62\% | 1.19\% | 0.67\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| \$2,494,400 | \$2,518,600 | \$42,561,400 | \$105,900 | \$4,592,100 | \$2,474,100 | \$1,134,000 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6.31\% | 6.21\% | 8.67\% | 0.13\% | 8.75\% | 18.17\% | 11.97\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| \$2,641,200 | \$2,704,600 | \$44,441,200 | \$108,600 | \$4,649,100 | \$2,454,100 | \$1,162,400 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 6.56\% | 6.18\% | 8.78\% | 0.13\% | 8.60\% | 17.77\% | 11.86\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |

SubTotal
Jul 1 - D
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent Oct 31 - Dollar Oct 31 - Percent

Student Services
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 1 Delar
Institutional Support
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar
Operation \& Maintenance
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Dollar
Oct 31 - Percent
Scholarships \& Fellowships
Jul 1 - Dollar
Jul 1 - Percent
Ct 31 - Porrcent
Total Educational \&\& General Expenditures

## Jul 1 - Dollar

Jul 1 - Percent
Oct 31 - Percent
\$24,531,100
\$24,531,100 $\mathbf{6 2 , 0 7 \%}$ 24,999,000 $62.07 \%$
$\mathbf{\$ 2 5 , 1 3 3 , 6 0 0}$ $\mathbf{2 5 , 1 3 3 , 6 0 0}$
$\mathbf{6 2 . 4 6 \%}$
$\$ 4,800,400$
$12.15 \%$
$\$ 4,964,700$
$12.34 \%$
$\$ 6,179,600$
$15.64 \%$
$\$ 6,141,700$
$15.26 \%$
$\$ 3,539,300$
$8.96 \%$
$\$ 3,527,900$
$8.77 \%$

$\$ 468,900$
$1.19 \%$
$\$ 468,900$
$1.17 \%$
\$9,411,600
$\$ 9,411,600$
$11.55 \%$
$\$ 10,000,500$
$11.66 \%$
$\begin{array}{rr}\$ 5,322,500 & \$ 262,500 \\ 10.14 \% & 1.93 \%\end{array}$
$\$ 8,083,700$
$85.50 \%$
$\$ 8,318,700$
$84.84 \%$

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 527,500$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 739,100$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| $\$ 49,072,000$ | $\$ 43,220,900$ | $\$ 12$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $60.23 \%$ | $82.34 \%$ |  |
| $\$ 51,766,100$ | $\$ 44,604,400$ | $\$ 12$, |
| $60,37 \%$ | $82.53 \%$ |  |

$\$ 12,183,900$
$89.47 \%$
$\$ 12,321,800$
$89.21 \%$
$\$ 455,800$
$4.81 \%$
$\$ 470,800$
$4.80 \%$

| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |

$\$ 410,500$

|  | $\$ 19,892,600$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $97.74 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | $\$ 20,962,900$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  | $97.88 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\$ 444,600$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  | $2.18 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | $\$ 444,600$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  | $2.08 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\$ 0$ |  |  |
| $.00 \%$ | $\$ 14,500$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $\$ 0$ | $0.07 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $\$ 10,000$ | $\$ 0$ |
|  | $0.05 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
|  |  |  |

$\begin{array}{rr}, 600,100 & \$ 730,300 \\ 1.90 \% & 0.85 \%\end{array}$
$\$ 5,453,8$
10.0
$\$ 262,6$
1.90
$\$ 0$
$0.00 \%$
$\$ 0$
$0.00 \%$

| $\$ 521,200$ | $\$ 444,600$ | $\$ 0$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $5.50 \%$ | $2.18 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\$ 552,600$ | $\$ 444,600$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $5.64 \%$ | $2.08 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 14,500$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 10,000$ | $\$ 0$ |
| $0.00 \%$ | $0.05 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| $\$ 9,471,200$ | $\$ 20,351,700$ | $\$ 527,500$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |
| $\$ 9,804,600$ | $\$ 21,417,500$ | $\$ 739,100$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |


| $\$ 81,470,900$ | $\$ 52,489,700$ | $\$ 13,617,200$ | $\$ 9,471,200$ | $\$ 20,351,700$ | $\$ 527,500$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |
| $\$ 85,745,200$ | $\$ 54,045,400$ | $\$ 13,811,500$ | $\$ 9,804,600$ | $\$ 21,417,500$ | $\$ 739,100$ |
| $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

SUMMARY OF PERCENT UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTIONAL AREA BY INSTITUTION FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS

JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12

|  | TSU McIntire- <br> Stennis | TSU Institute of Agriculture | TSU Cooperative Education | Sub-Total TBR System | UTC | UTK | UTM | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total UT } \\ \text { Formula } \\ \text { Universities } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { UT } \\ \text { Space } \\ \text { Institute } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instruction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$846,621,200 | \$48,394,000 | \$225,741,900 | \$38,318,200 | \$312,454,100 | \$5,051,800 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 49.90\% | 42.99\% | 45.68\% | 46.41\% | 45.33\% | 50.95\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$911,001,400 | \$51,893,500 | \$220,521,100 | \$40,304,500 | \$312,719,100 | \$4,939,900 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 49.41\% | 42.37\% | 42.75\% | 44.87\% | 42.95\% | 46.07\% |
| Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$170,700 | \$2,165,700 | \$0 | \$40,805,600 | \$1,807,000 | \$19,713,100 | \$439,000 | \$21,959,100 | \$779,900 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 2.41\% | 1.61\% | 3.99\% | 0.53\% | 3.19\% | 7.87\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$370,800 | \$6,518,400 | \$0 | \$54,252,700 | \$1,939,600 | \$36,275,000 | \$606,600 | \$38,821,200 | \$1,255,100 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 0.00\% | 2.94\% | 1.58\% | 7.03\% | 0.68\% | 5.33\% | 11.71\% |
| Public Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,915,000 | \$20,251,600 | \$2,155,600 | \$9,307,600 | \$540,300 | \$12,003,600 | \$67,300 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 1.19\% | 1.91\% | 1.88\% | 0.65\% | 1.74\% | 0.68\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,856,600 | \$28,847,500 | \$2,336,000 | \$9,905,500 | \$584,000 | \$12,825,500 | \$67,300 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 100.00\% | 1.56\% | 1.91\% | 1.92\% | 0.65\% | 1.76\% | 0.63\% |
| Academic Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$142,299,600 | \$7,926,800 | \$52,073,200 | \$9,936,000 | \$69,936,000 | \$268,300 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 8.39\% | 7.04\% | 10.54\% | 12.04\% | 10.15\% | 2.71\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$152,092,900 | \$8,550,500 | \$54,970,200 | \$10,193,600 | \$73,714,300 | \$536,100 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 8.25\% | 6.98\% | 10.66\% | 11.35\% | 10.12\% | 5.00\% |
| SubTotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$170,700 | \$2,165,700 | \$2,915,000 | \$1,049,978,000 | \$60,283,400 | \$306,835,800 | \$49,233,500 | \$416,352,700 | \$6,167,400 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 61.88\% | 53.55\% | 62.09\% | 59.64\% | 60.40\% | 62.20\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$370,800 | \$6,518,400 | \$7,856,600 | \$1,146,194,500 | \$64,719,600 | \$321,671,800 | \$51,688,700 | \$438,080,000 | \$6,798,400 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 62.17\% | 52.84\% | 62.36\% | 57.54\% | 60.16\% | 63.41\% |
| Student Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$228,522,200 | \$17,286,700 | \$42,537,800 | \$8,807,000 | \$68,631,500 | \$64,100 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 13.47\% | 15.36\% | 8.61\% | 10.67\% | 9.96\% | 0.65\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$241,360,800 | \$18,340,900 | \$43,300,200 | \$10,525,100 | \$72,166,200 | \$69,100 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 13.09\% | 14.98\% | 8.39\% | 11.72\% | 9.91\% | 0.64\% |
| Institutional Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$204,835,900 | \$11,361,600 | \$47,338,500 | \$6,609,100 | \$65,309,200 | \$1,751,500 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 12.07\% | 10.09\% | 9.58\% | 8.01\% | 9.47\% | 17.66\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$222,121,500 | \$12,722,600 | \$50,346,300 | \$7,983,100 | \$71,052,000 | \$1,872,900 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 12.05\% | 10.39\% | 9.76\% | 8.89\% | 9.76\% | 17.47\% |
| Operation \& Maintenance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$153,269,900 | \$13,944,100 | \$56,646,500 | \$10,859,900 | \$81,450,400 | \$1,804,300 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 9.03\% | 12.39\% | 11.46\% | 13.15\% | 11.82\% | 18.20\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$166,875,500 | \$17,420,100 | \$57,242,200 | \$12,550,800 | \$87,213,100 | \$1,852,600 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 9.05\% | 14.22\% | 11.10\% | 13.97\% | 11.98\% | 17.28\% |
| Scholarships \& Fellowships |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$60,067,300 | \$9,695,400 | \$40,810,200 | \$7,047,200 | \$57,552,900 | \$128,400 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 3.54\% | 8.61\% | 8.26\% | 8.54\% | 8.35\% | 1.30\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$67,027,100 | \$9,270,200 | \$43,308,300 | \$7,075,600 | \$59,654,100 | \$128,400 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 3.64\% | 7.57\% | 8.40\% | 7.88\% | 8.19\% | 1.20\% |
| Total Educational \& General Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$170,700 | \$2,165,700 | \$2,915,000 | \$1,696,673,300 | \$112,571,100 | \$494,168,900 | \$82,556,700 | \$689,296,700 | \$9,915,600 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$370,800 | \$6,518,400 | \$7,856,600 | \$1,843,579,400 | \$122,473,400 | \$515,868,800 | \$89,823,300 | \$728,165,500 | \$10,721,500 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

Table 3 (cont'd)
SUMMARY OF PERCENT UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTIONAL AREA BY INSTITUTION FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { UT } \\ \text { Memphis } \end{gathered}$ | UT College of Medicine |  | Agricultural <br> Experiment Station | Agricultural Extension Service | College of Veterinary Medicine | Institute for Public Service | MTAS | CTAS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instruction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$45,804,400 | \$52,596,500 | \$18,603,100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$28,223,100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 33.38\% | 83.73\% | 95.10\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 70.63\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$46,508,100 | \$57,179,000 | \$19,081,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$29,639,900 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 31.65\% | 78.04\% | 91.85\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 69.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$7,312,100 | \$459,700 | \$0 | \$31,666,400 | \$0 | \$3,578,700 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 5.33\% | 0.73\% | 0.00\% | 90.18\% | 0.00\% | 8.96\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$7,426,000 | \$3,758,300 | \$0 | \$36,160,200 | \$0 | \$4,643,700 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 5.05\% | 5.13\% | 0.00\% | 91.06\% | 0.00\% | 10.81\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Public Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$344,400 | \$15,400 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,438,000 | \$0 | \$3,892,500 | \$5,292,700 | \$4,754,300 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.25\% | 0.02\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 95.44\% | 0.00\% | 73.30\% | 95.03\% | 99.15\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$344,400 | \$16,100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$49,688,200 | \$74,000 | \$3,876,900 | \$5,421,300 | \$4,752,700 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.23\% | 0.02\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 96.19\% | 0.17\% | 73.00\% | 94.89\% | 99.15\% |
| Academic Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$27,956,700 | \$4,460,200 | \$0 | \$1,302,900 | \$763,400 | \$4,396,700 | \$0 | \$231,500 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 20.37\% | 7.10\% | 0.00\% | 3.71\% | 1.80\% | 11.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.16\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$30,154,900 | \$6,028,900 | \$0 | \$1,362,600 | \$759,600 | \$4,753,100 | \$0 | \$246,700 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 20.52\% | 8.23\% | 0.00\% | $3.43 \%$ | 1.47\% | 11.07\% | 0.00\% | 4.32\% | 0.00\% |
| SubTotal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$81,417,500 | \$57,531,900 | \$18,603,100 | \$32,969,300 | \$41,201,300 | \$36,198,500 | \$3,892,500 | \$5,524,200 | \$4,754,300 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 59.33\% | 91.58\% | 95.10\% | 93.89\% | 97.24\% | 90.59\% | 73.30\% | 99.19\% | 99.15\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$84,433,300 | \$66,982,300 | \$19,081,000 | \$37,522,800 | \$50,447,800 | \$39,110,700 | \$3,876,900 | \$5,668,000 | \$4,752,700 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 57.46\% | 91.43\% | 91.85\% | 94.49\% | 97.66\% | 91.05\% | 73.00\% | 99.21\% | 99.15\% |
| Student Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$3,201,800 | \$1,126,100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 2.33\% | 1.79\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$3,605,900 | \$1,145,800 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 2.45\% | 1.56\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Institutional Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$22,495,500 | \$2,362,400 | \$801,900 | \$1,619,300 | \$1,167,300 | \$891,100 | \$1,417,900 | \$45,200 | \$40,800 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 16.39\% | 3.76\% | 4.10\% | 4.61\% | 2.76\% | 2.23\% | 26.70\% | 0.81\% | 0.85\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$25,555,100 | \$2,717,800 | \$1,533,400 | \$1,630,800 | \$1,209,000 | \$901,900 | \$1,433,800 | \$45,200 | \$40,800 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 17.39\% | 3.71\% | 7.38\% | 4.11\% | 2.34\% | 2.10\% | 27.00\% | 0.79\% | 0.85\% |
| Operation \& Maintenance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$23,769,500 | \$100,000 | \$156,500 | \$526,700 | \$0 | \$2,811,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 17.32\% | 0.16\% | 0.80\% | 1.50\% | 0.00\% | 7.03\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$26,720,100 | \$574,800 | \$159,900 | \$558,000 | \$0 | \$2,903,100 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 18.18\% | 0.78\% | 0.77\% | 1.41\% | 0.00\% | 6.76\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Scholarships \& Fellowships |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$6,334,400 | \$1,699,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$58,400 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 4.62\% | 2.70\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.15\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$6,631,500 | \$1,843,900 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$40,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 4.51\% | 2.52\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.09\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Total Educational \& General Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$137,218,800 | \$62,819,400 | \$19,561,600 | \$35,115,300 | \$42,368,600 | \$39,959,100 | \$5,310,300 | \$5,569,500 | \$4,795,100 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$146,946,000 | \$73,264,600 | \$20,774,400 | \$39,711,500 | \$51,656,800 | \$42,955,700 | \$5,310,600 | \$5,713,200 | \$4,793,500 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

SUMMARY OF PERCENT UNRESTRICTED EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTIONAL AREA BY INSTITUTION FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS JULY 1 \& OCTOBER 31 BUDGETS 2011-12

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { UT } \\ \text { Univ.-Wide } \\ \text { Admin. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Sub-Total UT System | GRAND total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Instruction |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$462,733,100 | \$1,309,354,300 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 43.26\% | 47.33\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$470,067,000 | \$1,381,068,400 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 40.96\% | 46.17\% |
| Research |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$65,755,900 | \$106,561,500 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 6.15\% | 3.85\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$92,064,500 | \$146,317,200 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 8.02\% | 4.89\% |
| Public Service |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$66,808,100 | \$87,059,700 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 6.25\% | 3.15\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$77,066,400 | \$105,913,900 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 6.71\% | 3.54\% |
| Academic Support |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$109,315,600 | \$251,615,200 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 10.22\% | 9.10\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$117,556,200 | \$269,649,100 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 10.24\% | 9.01\% |
| SubTotal |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$704,612,700 | \$1,754,590,700 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 65.87\% | 63.43\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$756,754,000 | \$1,902,948,500 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 65.93\% | 63.62\% |
| Student Services |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$73,023,500 | \$301,545,700 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 6.83\% | 10.90\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$76,987,100 | \$318,347,900 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 6.71\% | 10.64\% |
| Institutional Support |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$17,705,700 | \$115,607,800 | \$320,443,700 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 10.81\% | 11.58\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$17,731,800 | \$125,724,400 | \$347,845,900 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 10.95\% | 11.63\% |
| Operation \& Maintenance |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$110,618,500 | \$263,888,400 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 10.34\% | 9.54\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$119,981,700 | \$286,857,200 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 10.45\% | 9.59\% |
| Scholarships \& Fellowships |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$0 | \$65,773,100 | \$125,840,400 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 0.00\% | 6.15\% | 4.55\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$0 | \$68,298,000 | \$135,325,100 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 0.00\% | 5.95\% | 4.52\% |
| Total Educational \& General Expenditures |  |  |  |
| Jul 1 - Dollar | \$17,705,700 | \$1,069,635,700 | \$2,766,309,000 |
| Jul 1 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Oct 31 - Dollar | \$17,731,800 | \$1,147,745,100 | \$2,991,324,500 |
| Oct 31 - Percent | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |

Table 4

## MANDATORY STUDENT FEE CHARGES 2010-11 \& 2011-12

|  | 2010-11 |  |  | 2011-12 |  |  | Percent Increase |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total <br> Mandatory Fees | Undergraduate Maintenance Fees | Total <br> Undergraduate Resident | Total Mandatory Fees | Undergraduate Maintenance Fees | Total <br> Undergraduate Resident | Total Mandatory Fees | Undergraduate Maintenance Fees | Total Undergraduate Resident |
| Austin Peay | \$1,224 | \$5,004 | \$6,228 | \$1,224 | \$5,466 | \$6,690 | 0.0\% | 9.2\% | 7.4\% |
| East Tennessee | \$1,000 | \$5,004 | \$6,004 | \$1,063 | \$5,466 | \$6,529 | 6.3\% | 9.2\% | 8.7\% |
| Middle Tennessee | \$1,474 | \$5,004 | \$6,478 | \$1,498 | \$5,520 | \$7,018 | 1.6\% | 10.3\% | 8.3\% |
| Tennessee State | \$850 | \$5,004 | \$5,854 | \$880 | \$5,466 | \$6,346 | 3.5\% | 9.2\% | 8.4\% |
| Tennessee Tech | \$1,032 | \$5,004 | \$6,036 | \$1,178 | \$5,520 | \$6,698 | 14.1\% | 10.3\% | 11.0\% |
| University of Memphis | \$1,212 | \$5,778 | \$6,990 | \$1,246 | \$6,450 | \$7,696 | 2.8\% | 11.6\% | 10.1\% |
| UT Chattanooga | \$1,150 | \$4,912 | \$6,062 | \$1,320 | \$5,398 | \$6,718 | 14.8\% | 9.9\% | 10.8\% |
| UT Knoxville | \$932 | \$6,450 | \$7,382 | \$1,172 | \$7,224 | \$8,396 | 25.8\% | 12.0\% | 13.7\% |
| UT Martin | \$1,058 | \$5,132 | \$6,190 | \$1,078 | \$5,640 | \$6,718 | 1.9\% | 9.9\% | 8.5\% |
| Chattanooga | \$295 | \$2,940 | \$3,235 | \$315 | \$3,252 | \$3,567 | 6.8\% | 10.6\% | 10.3\% |
| Cleveland | \$269 | \$2,940 | \$3,209 | \$269 | \$3,252 | \$3,521 | 0.0\% | 10.6\% | 9.7\% |
| Columbia | \$261 | \$2,940 | \$3,201 | \$271 | \$3,252 | \$3,523 | 3.8\% | 10.6\% | 10.1\% |
| Dyersburg | \$271 | \$2,940 | \$3,211 | \$281 | \$3,252 | \$3,533 | 3.7\% | 10.6\% | 10.0\% |
| Jackson | \$253 | \$2,940 | \$3,193 | \$277 | \$3,252 | \$3,529 | 9.5\% | 10.6\% | 10.5\% |
| Motlow | \$273 | \$2,940 | \$3,213 | \$276 | \$3,252 | \$3,528 | 1.1\% | 10.6\% | 9.8\% |
| Nashville | \$225 | \$2,940 | \$3,165 | \$225 | \$3,252 | \$3,477 | 0.0\% | 10.6\% | 9.9\% |
| Northeast | \$281 | \$2,940 | \$3,221 | \$281 | \$3,252 | \$3,533 | 0.0\% | 10.6\% | 9.7\% |
| Pellissippi | \$297 | \$2,940 | \$3,257 | \$317 | \$3,252 | \$3,569 | 6.7\% | 10.6\% | 9.6\% |
| Roane | \$281 | \$2,940 | \$3,221 | \$285 | \$3,252 | \$3,537 | 1.4\% | 10.6\% | 9.8\% |
| Southwest | \$285 | \$2,940 | \$3,225 | \$295 | \$3,252 | \$3,547 | 3.5\% | 10.6\% | 10.0\% |
| Volunteer | \$265 | \$2,940 | \$3,205 | \$267 | \$3,252 | \$3,519 | 0.8\% | 10.6\% | 9.8\% |
| Walters | \$269 | \$2,940 | \$3,209 | \$279 | \$3,252 | \$3,531 | 3.7\% | 10.6\% | 10.0\% |
| Technology Centers | \$200 | \$2,535 | \$2,735 | \$200 | \$2,775 | \$2,975 | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 8.8\% |

Table 5
COMPARISON OF MAJOR AUXILIARY ENTERPRISE REVENUES, EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS FOR THE TBR AND UT SYSTEMS

*Revenues include transfers from Auxiliary Fund Balance in order to balance Auxiliary Enterprises

## Table 6

Athletics Data 2010-11 \& 2011-12

|  | 2010-11 <br> General <br> Fund Support | Athletics General Fund as Percent of E\&G | 2010-11 <br> Student <br> Athletics Fee | 2010-11 <br> Student <br> Athl Fee Revenue | 2010-11 Athletics Budget |  | 2011-12 <br> General <br> Fund Support | Athletics General Fund as Percent of E\&G | 2011-12 <br> Student <br> Athletics Fee | 2011-12 <br> Student <br> Athl Fee Revenue | 2011-12 Athletics Budget |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| APSU | \$4,226,900 | 4.9\% | \$250 | \$2,141,900 | \$8,660,800 | APSU | \$4,770,700 | 4.8\% | \$250 | \$2,105,300 | \$8,772,500 |
| ETSU | 4,177,500 | 2.7\% | 250 | 3,660,400 | 9,677,100 | ETSU | 4,515,300 | 2.6\% | 250 | 3,650,000 | 9,865,500 |
| MTSU | 8,342,500 | 3.6\% | 350 | 6,134,200 | 19,338,800 | MTSU | 7,527,400 | 2.7\% | 350 | 7,950,000 | 20,471,600 |
| TSU | 4,725,200 | 4.5\% | 224 | 2,152,500 | 9,498,200 | TSU | 4,700,000 | 4.3\% | 224 | 2,100,000 | 9,005,000 |
| TTU | 4,207,400 | 4.0\% | 300 | 3,016,700 | 9,869,600 | TTU | 4,908,700 | 4.1\% | 350 | 3,550,000 | 10,152,600 |
| UM | 3,497,400 | 1.2\% | 450 | 8,757,800 | 37,377,200 | UM | 1,310,900 | 0.4\% | 450 | 8,690,000 | 35,881,300 |
| UTC | 5,034,600 | 4.4\% | 240 | 3,070,200 | 11,477,100 | UTC | 4,974,900 | 4.1\% | 360 | 3,976,700 | 12,794,300 |
| UTM | 4,431,300 | 5.3\% | 308 | 2,081,900 | 8,592,200 | UTM | 5,023,000 | 5.6\% | 308 | 2,075,000 | 8,943,700 |
| UTK* | 0 | NA | 0 | 1,000,000 | 102,480,800 | UTK* | 0 | NA | 0 | 1,000,000 | 103,250,000 |
| Subtotal | 38,642,900 |  |  | 32,015,400 | 216,972,000 | Subtotal | 37,730,900 |  |  | 35,097,000 | 219,136,600 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chattanooga | \$635,500 | 1.2\% | \$0 | \$0 | \$934,200 | Chattanooga | \$639,900 | 1.1\% | \$0 | \$0 | \$899,900 |
| Cleveland | 527,600 | 2.8\% | 0 | 0 | 801,000 | Cleveland | 571,400 | 2.6\% | 0 | 0 | 852,900 |
| Columbia | 379,300 | 1.5\% | 0 | 0 | 548,100 | Columbia | 375,300 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0 | 613,400 |
| Dyersburg | 349,300 | 2.2\% | 0 | 0 | 453,800 | Dyersburg | 365,700 | 2.1\% | 0 | 0 | 486,700 |
| Jackson | 375,200 | 1.6\% | 0 | 0 | 461,800 | Jackson | 365,600 | 1.4\% | 0 | 0 | 475,700 |
| Motlow | 366,600 | 1.8\% | 0 | 0 | 620,400 | Motlow | 393,000 | 1.7\% | 0 | 0 | 670,500 |
| Roane | 419,400 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0 | 635,200 | Roane | 429,600 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0 | 669,500 |
| Southwest | 610,800 | 0.9\% | 0 | 0 | 878,200 | Southwest | 607,100 | 0.8\% | 0 | 0 | 857,500 |
| Volunteer | 667,900 | 1.8\% | 0 | 0 | 848,500 | Volunteer | 695,900 | 1.7\% | 0 | 0 | 817,000 |
| Walters | 607,600 | 1.5\% | 0 | 0 | 859,600 | Walters | 692,200 | 1.6\% | 0 | 0 | 1,040,300 |
| Subtotal | 4,939,300 |  |  | - | 7,040,700 | Subtotal | 5,135,700 |  |  | - | 7,383,300 |
| Total | 43,582,100 |  |  | 32,015,400 | 224,012,700 | Total | 42,866,600 |  |  | 35,097,000 | 226,519,900 |

*Athletics at UTK are self supporting.

DATE: January 26, 2012
SUBJECT: Academic Program Review

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Information

The policy landscape of Tennessee higher education, guided by the 2010-2015 Public Agenda for Higher Education and the outcomes-based funding formula, requires a sharpened emphasis on institutional mission differentiation and the health and productivity of the state's academic programs.

In order to meet the goal of attaining the national average of adults with at least an associate degree by 2025, academic programs must be characterized by careful planning and evaluation to ensure adequate levels of degree production, minimized levels of redundancy in degree offerings, and a continued focus on the unique mission of each institution.

Since the inception of the revised Letter of Intent and program approval process in January 2010, approval of new academic programs occurs at each regular THEC meeting and all program proposals are required to address a range of issues related to the Complete College Tennessee Act. At the July 2011 Commission meeting, approval of new programs at the community colleges has been delegated to the Tennessee Board of Regents.

This Academic Program Review provides a holistic view of the status of degree programs throughout the state, including:

Program Activity Report: Depicts new programs that have been added to the state inventory in the previous year as well as programs that have been terminated.

Post Approval Monitoring: Assesses success of new programs approved within the last five years against their projected enrollment, graduation and financial goals. In order to gain a sense of how similar new programs have fared, this information should be utilized by all institutions during the program proposal process.

Program Productivity Review: On-going monitoring of all programs in operation for more than five years is conducted to identify those that are not graduating a sufficient number of students as well as those that are thriving. This report highlights top-producing statewide programs and top-producing programs at individual institutions. These analyses provide insight into the mission distinction of each institution.

Performance Funding Qualitative Reviews: Results of accreditation reviews, consultant evaluations, or academic audits of established programs as a Performance Funding qualitative measure.

## 1) Program Activity Report

The Commission has the statutory responsibility to review and approve new academic programs. New programs are developed as the needs and demands within the state warrant. The responsibility of program termination lies with the two governing boards, although the Commission staff may recommend termination to the TBR and UT systems.

During 2011, the Commission approved a total of 23 new programs and the governing boards terminated 17 programs. The Board of Regents approved 67 certificate programs that were less than 24 credit hours. A complete listing of program approvals and terminations can be found in Appendix A.

Table 1: 2011 New Programs and Terminations

|  | New <br> Programs | Reactivation | Terminations | Net Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | 6 | 0 | 7 | -1 |
| UT System | 2 | 1 | 8 | -5 |
| TBR Community Colleges | 84 | 0 | 2 | 82 |
| Total Actions | $\mathbf{9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 6}$ |

- Of the 92 new programs, 69 programs were certificates of less than 24 credit hours approved by the Board of Regents. Additionally, THEC approved the General Education Core certificate at all community colleges, which is a credential that recognizes completion of the 41 credit hour curriculum that fulfills the Tennessee Transfer Pathways general education requirements.
- THEC also approved seven graduate programs and a single program at both the baccalaureate and associate degree level. Each of these programs was approved under the new program approval process and is congruent with the institutional mission profile.
- The programs terminated by the governing boards during the previous year represented an almost equal mix of baccalaureate and post-baccalaureate level programs. One doctoral program, one Educational Specialist and seven Master's programs were removed from the state inventory, while five bachelors and two programs at the community colleges were terminated.


## 2) Post Approval Monitoring

Newly approved programs are evaluated under the Post Approval Monitoring cycle for five years at the baccalaureate level and above and three years for pre-baccalaureate programs. This review evaluates programs against enrollment and graduate projections, program cost, program progress toward accreditation, and other goals agreed upon by the governing boards and THEC through program authorization.

THEC can recommend termination for those programs that do not, over the monitoring period, show improvement. The full summary of Post Approval Monitoring can be found in Appendix B.

Table 2: Summary of Post Approval Monitoring

|  | Programs <br> Meeting <br> Benchmarks | Programs Not <br> Meeting <br> Benchmarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | 13 | 21 |
| UT System | 8 | 14 |
| TBR Community Colleges | 4 | 7 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 2}$ |

Of the 67 programs reviewed during the 2011 Post Approval Monitoring cycle, 25 or $37 \%$ met the projections listed in the program proposal or exceeded productivity benchmarks.

## 3) Program Productivity Review

Once a program completes the Post Approval Monitoring cycle, it is considered "mature" and is then evaluated through THEC's Program Productivity review. The purpose of this review is to ensure that demand for the programs continues as is evidenced by the number of graduates produced.

This process identifies programs that are not meeting nationally-used graduate production benchmarks:

- An average of ten graduates per year over a five-year period for baccalaureate and pre-baccalaureate programs
- An average of five graduates for master's programs over five-years, and
- An average of three graduates for doctorates over this same period of time.

Using these reports as tools, the systems work with institutions in determining whether to terminate or commit necessary resources to strengthen low-producing programs. In so doing, institutions may retain programs that may not produce a desired number of graduates but may otherwise contribute to the general education curriculum in providing service courses or complementing other degree offerings.

Programs identified as low producing for the 2010-11 academic year can be found in Appendix C.

Table 3: Low-Producing Program Status - January 2012

|  | Low <br> Producing | Consolidate | Terminate | Retain |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | 32 | 2 | 4 | 26 |
| UT System | 43 | 0 | 9 | 34 |
| TBR Community Colleges | 29 | 0 | 2 | 27 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 7}$ |

Based on feedback from both the system and institutional level, Commission staff conducted analysis of low-producing programs to identify those degree fields which constituted core academic programs essential to the institution's general education infrastructure, and were under-productive at more than three institutions.

Following these guidelines, programs in Mathematics, Philosophy and Physics were extracted and identified as "Core CIP" programs, rather than as simply low-producing programs and are not included in this report.

There are currently 15 programs that have either been terminated by governing boards or are awaiting action by TBR and UT. If students are enrolled in the program, it is phased out over time to allow all students the opportunity to graduate. Thus, terminating a program with enrolled students does not realize immediate cost savings. Furthermore, in many cases institutions preserve the field and the tenured faculty in it by lodging the terminated program as a concentration under another related degree program.

Close to 90 low-producing programs were recommended by the institution for retention. Many of the low producing programs identified for retention were also submitted with steps identified to improve overall program productivity as well as a discussion of the program contribution courses to general education or academic minors.

Productive Programs. The academic program review included analysis of not only low-producing programs, but also sought to identify those programs which are highly productive and are worthy of mention as successful academic programs at each institution.

The distribution of productive programs among four year institutions was diverse, ranging from health professions programs to interdisciplinary programs intended for adult students.

However, among community colleges, the General Transfer Associate degree intended to prepare students for admission to a four year university was the most productive program. This indicates that the vast majority of degrees awarded at this level are to students likely seeking to fulfill the general education requirements of a bachelor's degree program.

## Austin Peay State University

- Bachelor Business Admin, BBA
- Master's Management, MS


## East Tennessee State University

- Bachelor Nursing, BSN
- Master's Nursing, MSN
- Doctoral Education Leadership, EdD


## Middle Tennessee State University

- Bachelor Liberal Studies
- Master's Curriculum and Instruction, MEd
- Doctoral Human Performance, PhD

Tennessee State University

- Bachelor Interdisciplinary Studies, BS
- Master's Nursing, MSN
- Doctoral Doctor of Physical Therapy, DPT


## Tennessee Technological University

- Bachelor Multidisciplinary Studies, BS
- Master's Educational Leadership, MA
- Doctoral Engineering, PhD


## University of Memphis

- Bachelor Professional Studies, BS
- Master's Teaching, MAT
- Doctoral Psychology, PhD


## University of Tennessee System

## University of Tennessee- Chattanooga

- Bachelor Business Administration, BS
- Master's Business Administration, MBA
- Doctoral Doctor of Physical Therapy, DPT


## University of Tennessee- Knoxville

- Bachelor Psychology, BA
- Master's Business Administration, MBA
- Doctoral Education, PhD

University of Tennessee- Martin

- Bachelor Individualized Program, BS
- Master's Business Administration, MBA


## 4) Performance Funding Qualitative Reviews

Within the state's Performance Funding accountability program, institutions are required to evaluate undergraduate and graduate programs. These reviews call for institutions to first develop self-evaluations of programs under review. The accreditation peer review process satisfies the Performance Funding requirements for programs that are eligible for accreditation. Other programs must undergo evaluation by external consultants or trained teams of auditors.

The purpose of academic program review is to ensure that standards of the discipline are being met and that adequate financial support is evident. Each program is reviewed according to accreditation review cycles or at least once every five to seven years by THEC program evaluation criteria.

Table 4: Academic Program Evaluation by Type

|  | Accreditable <br> Programs | Traditional <br> Program <br> Review | Academic <br> Audit | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | 295 | 172 | 66 | 533 |
| UT System | 127 | 148 | 0 | 275 |
| TBR Comm Colleges | 148 | 39 | 96 | 283 |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 9 1}$ |
| Percentage | $52 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $15 \%$ |  |

- During 2010-11, approximately 80 academic programs were evaluated using the traditional program review or academic audit. Effective with the 2010-15 performance funding cycle, associate degree programs that contain embedded certificates are evaluated as part of the respective associate degree program. Embedded certificates are programs whose curriculum, content and requirements are contained within the greater requirements of a related associate degree program. For example, the Criminal Justice AAS degree would be responsible for evaluating the Homeland Security technical certificate degree program.

These reviews and subsequent follow-up by the institutions and governing boards also help to assess program quality, need, and demand.

- Currently 570 programs are eligible for accreditation. Eligibility is determined when all Tennessee institutions agree on a specific accreditor as best representing qualitative standards for each discipline. All programs are accredited except for newly approved programs (39) and two programs in which accreditation is pending. It is projected that by the end of the 2010-15 performance funding cycle, all mature eligible programs will be accredited. Annually, institutions are now required to provide status reports for all programs that are seeking accreditation.


## Appendix A <br> Program Activity Report: New Programs

In 2011, THEC approved 23 new programs (3 doctoral, 4 masters, 1 bachelor, 1 associate and 14 certificate degree programs).

|  | Institution | Academic Program | Degree Level | Approval Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Volunteer | Veterinary Technology | Associate | Jan-11 |
| 2 | Tennessee Tech | Environmental and Sustainability Studies | Bachelor | Nov-11 |
| 3 | East Tennessee | Geosciences | Masters | Jul-11 |
| 4 | Middle Tennessee | Information Systems | Masters | May-11 |
| 5 | Middle Tennessee | Leisure and Sport Management | Masters | May-11 |
| 6 | Middle Tennessee | International Affairs | Masters | May-11 |
| 7 | UT Knoxville | Energy Science and Engineering | Doctorate | Jan-11 |
| 8 | Univ of Memphis | Epidemiology | Doctorate | Jul-11 |
| 9 | UT Knoxville | Social Work | Doctorate | Jul-11 |
| 10 | Chattanooga | Process Technology (24 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 11 | Chattanooga | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 12 | Cleveland | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 13 | Columbia | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 14 | Dyersburg | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 15 | Jackson | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 16 | Motlow | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 17 | Nashville | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 18 | Northeast | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 19 | Pellissippi | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 20 | Roane | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 21 | Southwest | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 22 | Volunteer | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 23 | Walters | General Education Core (41 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |

## Appendix A Program Activity Report: New Programs

In 2011, the Tennessee Board of Regents approved 69 certificates of less than 24 credit hours.

|  | Institution | Academic Program | Degree Level | Approval Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Chattanooga | Advanced Process Technology (17 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 2 | Chattanooga | Chemical Laboratory Technology (22 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 3 | Chattanooga | Animal Care Technology (18 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 4 | Chattanooga | Early Childhood Education (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 5 | Chattanooga | Management (21 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 6 | Chattanooga | Lean Manufacturing (21 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 7 | Chattanooga | Web Design (18 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 8 | Chattanooga | Web Programming ( 21 hrs ) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 9 | Chattanooga | General Education Core (15-17 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 10 | Chattanooga | Basic Bookkeeping (15 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 11 | Chattanooga | Basic Tax Accounting (15 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 12 | Chattanooga | Entrepreneurship (18 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 13 | Chattanooga | Paralegal Studies (18 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 14 | Chattanooga | Mechanical Systems (20 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 15 | Chattanooga | Electrical \& Instr. Systems (20 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 16 | Chattanooga | Automotive Production Technology (20 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 17 | Cleveland | Network Systems Design (20 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 18 | Cleveland | Architectural Design (22 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 19 | Cleveland | Civil Technology ( 21 hrs ) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 20 | Cleveland | Electrical Maint Fundamentals (16 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 21 | Cleveland | Industrial Auto Fundamentals (19 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 22 | Cleveland | Mechanical Drafting (19 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 23 | Cleveland | Mech Maintenance Fundamentals (15 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 24 | Cleveland | Zero Energy Housing (17 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 25 | Cleveland | Climate Control (22 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 26 | Cleveland | Technology Essentials (12 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 27 | Cleveland | Process Control Fundamentals (21 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 28 | Cleveland | Construction Applications (21 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 29 | Cleveland | Construction Surveying (17 hrs) | Certificate | Apr-11 |
| 30 | Cleveland | Pre-Allied Health (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 31 | Cleveland | General Education Core (15-17 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 32 | Columbia | Pre-Allied Health (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 33 | Columbia | General Education Core (15-17 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |


|  | Institution | Academic Program | Degree Level | Approval Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | Dyersburg | Pre-Allied Health (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 35 | Dyersburg | General Education Core (15-17 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 36 | Jackson | Pre-Allied Health (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 37 | Jackson | General Education Core (15-17 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 38 | Jackson | Phlebotomy Technician (9 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 39 | Nashville | Pre-Allied Health (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 40 | Nashville | General Education Core (15-17 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 41 | Northeast | Pre-Allied Health (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 42 | Northeast | General Education Core (15-17 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 43 | Pellissippi | Digital Imaging for Photography (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 44 | Pellissippi | Univ Computer Science Preparation (16 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 45 | Pellissippi | Information Systems Fundamentals (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 46 | Pellissippi | Web Page Authoring (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 47 | Pellissippi | E-Commerce Web Design (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 48 | Pellissippi | Mobile Web Design (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 49 | Pellissippi | Accessible Web Design (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 50 | Pellissippi | Web Design Tools (13 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 51 | Pellissippi | A+/Network+Certification Prep (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 52 | Pellissippi | Architectural AutoCAD Applications ( 15 hrs ) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 53 | Pellissippi | Electronics Technology (14 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 54 | Pellissippi | Pre-Business Transfer (14 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 55 | Pellissippi | Basic Photography (16 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 56 | Pellissippi | Elect Health Records Specialist (13 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 57 | Pellissippi | Promotion Methods (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 58 | Pellissippi | Supervision (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 59 | Pellissippi | Accounting Specialist (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 60 | Pellissippi | Document Specialists (12 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 61 | Pellissippi | General Hospitality (13 hrs) | Certificate | Jan-11 |
| 62 | Pellissippi | Pre-Allied Health (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 63 | Pellissippi | General Education Core (15-17 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 64 | Volunteer | Web Designer (Level I) (18 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 65 | Volunteer | Web Designer (Level II) (18 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 66 | Volunteer | Pre-Allied Health (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 67 | Volunteer | General Education Core (15-17 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |
| 68 | Volunteer | Paralegal Studies (19 hrs) | Certificate | Jul-11 |
| 69 | Walters | Pre-Allied Health (23 hrs) | Certificate | Jun-11 |

## Appendix A <br> Program Activity Report: Terminated Programs

In 2011, the governing boards terminated 17 programs (2 pre-baccalaureate, 6 bachelors, and 9 graduate).

|  | Institution | Academic Program | Degree Level |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Cleveland | Workforce Preparedness | Certificate |
| 2 | East Tennessee | Biomedical Sciences | Masters |
| 3 | Jackson | Early Childhood Education | Associate |
| 4 | Tennessee State | English | Masters |
| 5 | Tennessee State | Mathematical Sciences | Masters |
| 6 | Tennessee State | Music Education | Masters |
| 7 | Tennessee State | Foreign Languages | Bachelors |
| 8 | Tennessee State | Africana Studies | Bachelors |
| 9 | Tennessee State | Physics | Bachelors |
| 10 | UT Knoxville | Health \& Human Sciences | Doctorate |
| 11 | UT Knoxville | Planning | Masters |
| 12 | UT Knoxville | Safety | Masters |
| 13 | UT Knoxville | Individualized Program | Bachelors |
| 14 | UT Knoxville | Sport Studies | Masters |
| 15 | UT Knoxville | School Counseling | Educ Specialist |
| 16 | UT Knoxville | Sport Management | Bachelors |
| 17 | UT Knoxville | Engineering Physics | Bachelors |

# Appendix B <br> 2010-11 Post Approval Monitoring Programs - Benchmarks Attained 

## Austin Peay State University

- Teaching, MAT


## East Tennessee State University

- Anthropology, BA
- Pharmacy, PharmD
- Sports, Physiology \& Performance, PhD


## Middle Tennessee State University

- Global Studies, BA
- Exercise Studies, BS
- Forensic Science, BS
- Literacy Studies, PhD
- Computational Science, PhD
- Math and Science Education, PhD


## University of Memphis

- Interior Design, BFA

Tennessee State University

- Physical Therapy, DPT


## Regents Online Campus Collaborative

- Master of Professional Studies


## Chattanooga State Community College

- Paramedic, Certificate

Nashville State Community College

- Healthcare Management, AAS


## University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

- Mathematics, MS


## University of Tennessee, Knoxville

- Landscape Architecture, MLA, MA, MS
- School Psychology, PhD
- Exercise and Sports Science, PhD
- Nutritional Sciences, PhD


## University of Tennessee, Martin

- Finance, BSBA


## University of Tennessee

## Health Science Center

- Health Informatics and Information Management, MS
- Dental Hygiene, MDH
- Allied Health Services, AAS

Volunteer State Community College

- Criminal Justice/Law Enforcement, AAS


## Appendix B <br> 2010-11 Post-Approval Monitoring Benchmarks Not Attained

## Austin Peay State University

- Chemical Engineering Tech, AAS*
- Military History, MA*


## East Tennessee State University

- International Affairs, BA*
- Theatre, BA
- Women's Studies, BA
- Bluegrass, Old Time, and Country Music, BA
- Allied Health, MSAH
- Early Childhood Education, PhD*
- Public Health, DrPH*
- Clinical Psychology, PhD
- Environmental Health, PhD


## Middle Tennessee State University

- Horse Science, MS*
- Molecular Bioscience, PhD*


## Tennessee State University

- Urban Studies, BS*
- Occupational Therapy, MOT*
- Public Health, MPH


## University of Memphis

- Public Health, MPH*
- Architecture, MS
- Computer Science, MS*
- Computer Science, PhD*
- Social and Behavior Science, PhD*


## University of Tennessee, Chattanooga

- Mechanical Engineering, BS*
- Early Childhood Education, BS*
- Electrical Engineering, BS
- Athletic Training, MS*
- Doctor of Nursing Practice, DNP*

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

- Reliability and Maintainability Engineering, MS
- Biomedical Engineering, MS*
- Biomedical Engineering, PhD*
- Educational Psychology and Research, PhD*
- Counselor Education, PhD
- Higher Education Administration, PhD
- Child and Family Studies, PhD
- Retail, Hospitality, and Tourism Management, PhD


## University of Tennessee

 Health Science Center- Cytopathology Practice, MS


## Dyersburg State Community College

- Paramedic, Certificate *
- Emergency Services, AAS *


## Nashville State Community College

- 3D Design and Graphics, Certificate
- Paralegal Studies, AAS *
- Logistics Technology, AAS

Southwest TN Community College

- Paramedic, AAS *


## Walters State Community College

- Clean Energy Technology, AAS
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## Appendix C <br> Program Productivity Report: Low Producing Programs

At the universities, 75 programs were identified as low-producing based on the report of graduates from 2005-06 through 2009-10. Number of low-producing programs by degree level: 50 baccalaureate, 19 Master's and 6 doctoral programs.

| Institution | CIP | Academic Program | Degree Level | 5 Yr. <br> Avg. | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benchmark for Baccalaureate Programs: 10 graduates over a 5-year period |  |  |  |  |  |
| Univ of Memphis | 04.0401 | Architecture | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| Univ of Memphis | 05.0201 | Africana Studies | Bachelor | 7 | Retain |
| UT Martin | 11.0701 | Computer Science | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| Tennessee Tech | 11.0801 | Web Design | Bachelor | 6 | Consolidate |
| UT Chattanooga | 13.1001 | Exceptional Learning | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| Tennessee State | 13.1210 | Early Childhood Ed. | Bachelor | 4 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 13.1302 | Art Education | Bachelor | 2 | Retain |
| Univ of Memphis | 13.1314 | PE Teacher Education | Bachelor | 7 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 13.1319 | Human Resource Development | Bachelor | 7 | Terminate |
| Tennessee State | 14.0801 | Civil Engineering | Bachelor | 6 | Retain |
| Univ of Memphis | 14.0901 | Computer Engineering | Bachelor | 5 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 14.1801 | Materials Eng. | Bachelor | 5 | Retain |
| Tennessee State | 14.1901 | Mechanical Eng | Bachelor | 7 | Retain |
| Middle Tennessee | 15.0303 | Environmental Science | Bachelor | 6 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 15.1501 | Industrial Technology Mgmt | Bachelor | 5 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 16.0101 | Foreign Languages | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| Tennessee Tech | 16.0101 | Foreign Languages | Bachelor | 9 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 16.0402 | Russian | Bachelor | 1 | Terminate |
| UT Knoxville | 16.0501 | German | Bachelor | 5 | Terminate |
| UT Martin | 16.0901 | French | Bachelor | 1 | Terminate |
| UT Knoxville | 16.0902 | Italian | Bachelor | 3 | Terminate |
| Austin Peay | 16.0905 | Spanish | Bachelor | 3 | Terminate |
| UT Martin | 16.0905 | Spanish | Bachelor | 5 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 24.0103 | Humanities | Bachelor | 5 | Retain |
| Tennessee State | 27.0101 | Mathematics | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| Tennessee Tech | 27.0101 | Mathematics | Bachelor | 6 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 27.0301 | Applied Math | Bachelor | 5 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 38.0201 | Religious Studies | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 38.9999 | Philosophy/Religion | Bachelor | 7 | Retain |
| UT Martin | 40.0501 | Chemistry | Bachelor | 7 | Retain |
| Austin Peay | 40.0601 | Geosciences | Bachelor | 9 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 40.0601 | Geology | Bachelor | 5 | Retain |
| Tennessee Tech | 40.0601 | Geosciences | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 40.0601 | Geology | Bachelor | 9 | Terminate |
| UT Martin | 40.0601 | Geoscience | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| Tennessee Tech | 40.0801 | Physics | Bachelor | 4 | Retain |
| Univ of Memphis | 45.0701 | Geography | Bachelor | 9 | Consolidate |
| UT Martin | 45.0901 | International Studies | Bachelor | 6 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 50.0501 | Theatre | Bachelor | 3 | Retain |


| Institution | CIP | Academic Program | Degree Level | $5 \text { Yr. }$ Avg. | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tennessee State | 50.0701 | Art | Bachelor | 7 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 50.0703 | Art History | Bachelor | 9 | Retain |
| Univ of Memphis | 50.0703 | Art History | Bachelor | 6 | Retain |
| East Tennessee | 50.0901 | Music | Bachelor | 9 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 50.0901 | Music | Bachelor | 9 | Retain |
| Tennessee State | 51.0701 | Health Care Admin | Bachelor | 9 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 51.1005 | Clinical Lab Science | Bachelor | 2 | Retain |
| UT Martin | 51.9999 | Health Sciences | Bachelor | 2 | Terminate |
| Middle Tennessee | 52.0204 | Office Management | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| East Tennessee | 52.0601 | Economics | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| Tennessee State | 54.0101 | History | Bachelor | 8 | Retain |
| Benchmark for Master's Programs: 5 graduates over a 5-year period |  |  |  |  |  |
| UT Knoxville | 01.0901 | Animal Science | Masters | 4 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 01.1001 | Food Science | Masters | 4 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 01.1105 | Entomology/Plant Pathology | Masters | 3 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 01.1202 | Environmental/Soil Science | Masters | 2 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 03.0501 | Forestry | Masters | 3 | Retain |
| East Tennessee | 13.1299 | Teaching (ROCC) | Masters | 1 | Retain |
| Austin Peay | 13.1299 | Teaching (ROCC) | Masters | 1 | Retain |
| Tennessee State | 13.1299 | Teaching (ROCC) | Masters | 1 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 14.3201 | Polymer Engineering | Masters | 2 | Terminate |
| UT Knoxville | 26.0202 | Biochemistry | Masters | 2 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 26.1301 | Ecology/Evo. Biology | Masters | 4 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 26.9999 | Life Sciences | Masters | 2 | Retain |
| Middle Tennessee | 40.0501 | Chemistry | Masters | 3 | Retain |
| Austin Peay | 42.0101 | Psychology | Masters | 4 | Retain |
| Middle Tennessee | 49.0104 | Aviation Administration | Masters | 2 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 50.0901 | Music | Masters | 4 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 51.9999 | Comparative/Exper Medicine | Masters | 1 | Retain |
| East Tennessee | 52.0206 | Public Admin. | Masters | 2 | Terminate |
| UT Knoxville | 52.1301 | Management Science | Masters | 4 | Retain |
| Benchmark for Doctoral Programs: 3 graduates over a 5-year period. |  |  |  |  |  |
| UT Knoxville | 14.0301 | Biosystems Eng. | Doctoral | 1 | Retain |
| Tennessee State | 14.0901 | Comp/Info Systems | Doctoral | 0 | Retain |
| UT Chattanooga | 14.2701 | Computational Engineering | Doctoral | 1 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 38.0101 | Philosophy | Doctoral | 1 | Retain |
| UT Knoxville | 51.0204 | Speech/Hearing Science | Doctoral | 1 | Terminate |
| UT Knoxville | 52.1301 | Management Science | Doctoral | 2 | Retain |

## Appendix C <br> Program Productivity Report: Low Producing Programs

At the community colleges, 29 programs were identified as low-producing based on the report of graduates from 2007-08 through 2009-10.

| Institution | CIP | Academic Program | $3 \mathbf{Y r} .$ <br> Average | Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benchmark for Associate Programs: 10 graduates over a 3-year period. |  |  |  |  |
| Walters | 01.0603 | Production Horticulture | 9 | Retain |
| Dyersburg | 11.0401 | Computer Information Technology | 5 | Retain |
| Chattanooga | 13.0101 | Teaching | 6 | Retain |
| Cleveland | 13.0101 | Teaching | 0 | Retain |
| Dyersburg | 13.0101 | Teaching | 5 | Retain |
| Jackson | 13.0101 | Teaching | 9 | Retain |
| Nashville | 13.0101 | Teaching | 6 | Retain |
| Northeast | 13.0101 | Teaching | 7 | Retain |
| Southwest | 13.0101 | Teaching | 1 | Retain |
| Volunteer | 13.0101 | Teaching | 2 | Retain |
| Walters | 13.0101 | Teaching | 3 | Retain |
| Nashville | 15.0000 | Arch, Civil \& Con Engineering Tech | 8 | Retain |
| Chattanooga | 15.0612 | Industrial Maintenance | 3 | Terminate |
| Roane | 19.0706 | Early Childhood | 4 | Retain |
| Walters | 19.0706 | Early Childhood | 4 | Retain |
| Chattanooga | 21.0101 | Applied Technology | 9 | Retain |
| Pellissippi | 21.0101 | General Technology | 6 | Retain |
| Volunteer | 21.0101 | General Technology | 0 | Retain |
| Southwest | 26.1201 | Biotechnology | 3 | Retain |
| Dyersburg | 43.0107 | Corrections | 5 | Retain |
| Northeast | 43.0107 | Public Safety | 2 | Retain |
| Nashville | 44.0201 | Social Services | 5 | Terminate |
| Cleveland | 44.9999 | Public and Government Service | 6 | Retain |
| Southwest | 47.0101 | Electronics Technology | 5 | Retain |
| Nashville | 47.0604 | Automotive Tech | 4 | Retain |
| Volunteer | 51.1004 | Medical Lab Tech | 7 | Retain |
| Volunteer | 51.1803 | Ophthalmic Tech | 8 | Retain |
| Roane | 51.2202 | Environmental Health Tech | 4 | Retain |
| Southwest | 51.3104 | Dietetic Technology | 9 | Retain |
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Staff will present an overview of a lottery scholarship special report, which for the first time provides detailed information on five programs within the lottery scholarship family of programs that are smaller, both in terms of students served and dollars expended:

- Dual Enrollment Grant;
- HOPE Foster Care Grant;
- Helping Heroes Grant;
- Math and Science Teacher Loan Forgiveness Program; and
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The report provides analysis of participant demographics; scholarship renewal and student progression; and, where possible, graduation rates.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Dual Enrollment Grant

- Dual Enrollment Grant participants have higher high school GPA's and the same average composite ACT score as Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship (TELS) recipients. ${ }^{1}$ They also require less remedial and/or developmental learning support
- As a result, Grant


## Rural Health Loan Forgiveness Program

- The Rural Health Loan Forgiveness Program is a five year pilot program, which will admit its final cohort in 2012-13.
- A majority of recipients are Caucasian females; however, the program has seen minority student participation increase in recent years.
- Since the program's inception 120 students have participated.
- Enrollment is concentrated at TICUA institutions.


## PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

Comprising eleven financial aid programs, the Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship (TELS) provided financial aid to $101,569^{2}$ students at a cost of $\$ 297,589,674$ in 2010-11 (Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation [TSAC], 2011). The four largest programs (the HOPE scholarship program, the General Assembly Merit Scholarship program [GAMS], the ASPIRE award, and the Tennessee HOPE ACCESS Grant), which are referred to colloquially as the Hope Scholarship program, account for 74 percent of the students and 89 percent of TELS expenditures. There is a growing body of research ${ }^{3}$ focusing on these four programs, including an annual fact book published by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC). ${ }^{4}$ However, research on the smaller TELS programs remains scant.

This report provides a descriptive overview of five of the smaller TELS programs, including: the Dual Enrollment Grant, the HOPE Foster Grant, the Helping Heroes Grant, the Math \& Science Teacher Loan Forgiveness program, and the Rural Health Loan Forgiveness program. The goal of this report is to provide legislators, policymakers, and researchers with a basic understanding of these five TELS programs and the students they serve. Specifically, the report examines the number of students served by each program, their demographics, academic preparation, postsecondary enrollment trends, and their postsecondary progression and success. Additionally, it highlights some of the data challenges that were identified by the researchers. The report is broken into five sections, covering each of the five programs. The two appendices discuss data limitations and present more detailed data tables, respectively.
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## OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN THE REPORT

Table A presents the number of students served and total cost of all Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship (TELS) programs since inception. ${ }^{5}$ Since 2004, TELS has served 526,614 students and has provided almost $\$ 1.5$ billion for postsecondary students in financial aid. The three largest programs, HOPE, GAMS, and ASPIRE accounted for 70 percent of the students served and almost 91 percent of the programs' total expenditures.

This report is limited to the programs denoted by italics in the table below. These five programs account for 13.4 percent ( 70,704 students) of TELS students and 2.3 percent ( $\$ 33.5$ million) of TELS expenditures. The programs provide grants and loans eligible for forgiveness to sub-special populations of students participating in Tennessee postsecondary education. The sections that follow provide an overview of the programs' history, the students that they serve, and their success.

Table A: Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship (TELS) participants and allocation since inception* by program

|  | Students Served | Dollars Awarded |  | \% of TELS <br> Students <br> Served | \% of Dollars Awarded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HOPE <br> GAMS <br> ASPIRE | included in Subtotal |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal (HOPE, GAMS, ASPIRE) | 369,041 | \$ | 1,354,491,206 | 70.08\% | 90.96\% |
| HOPE ACCESS Grant | 2,255 | \$ | 4,644,032 | 0.43\% | 0.31\% |
| HOPE Non-Traditional | 7,790 | \$ | 18,268,706 | 1.48\% | 1.23\% |
| Wilder-Naifeh Grant | 76,824 | \$ | 78,248,339 | 14.59\% | 5.25\% |
| HOPE Foster Care Grant | 163 | \$ | 624,674 | 0.03\% | 0.04\% |
| Dual Enrollment Grant | 69,188 | \$ | 29,806,925 | 13.14\% | 2.00\% |
| Math \& Science Teachers Loan Forgiveness | 103 | \$ | 199,000 | 0.02\% | 0.01\% |
| Helping Heroes Grant | 1,130 | \$ | 1,558,856 | 0.21\% | 0.10\% |
| Rural Health Loan Forgiveness | 120 | \$ | 1,272,767 | 0.02\% | 0.09\% |
| Total | 526,614 | \$ | 1,489,114,505 | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
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Table 3:

|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2005- \\ 06 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ 09 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2009- \\ 10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2010- \\ 11 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Dual <br> Enrollment <br> Recipients | Female <br> Male | $\begin{aligned} & 59 \% \\ & 41 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61 \% \\ & 39 \% \end{aligned}$ | $61 \%$ $39 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \% \\ & 40 \% \end{aligned}$ | 60\% $40 \%$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61 \% \\ & 39 \% \end{aligned}$ |
|  | TELS <br> Recipients* | Female <br> Male | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \% \\ & 40 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \% \\ & 40 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 59 \% \\ & 41 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 59 \% \\ & 41 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 59 \% \\ & 41 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 59 \% \\ & 41 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Race | Dual <br> Enrollment <br> Recipients | African American <br> Caucasian <br> Other | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \% \\ 90 \% \\ 5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 4 \% \\ 90 \% \\ 6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \% \\ 89 \% \\ 6 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 8 \% \\ 85 \% \\ 7 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \% \\ 78 \% \\ 13 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \% \\ 83 \% \\ 8 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | TELS Recipients* | African American <br> Caucasian Other | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \% \\ 87 \% \\ 4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \% \\ 87 \% \\ 4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \% \\ 86 \% \\ 5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 9 \% \\ 86 \% \\ 4 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \% \\ 85 \% \\ 5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 10 \% \\ 84 \% \\ 5 \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| \% with at least one parent with an Associate's degree or higher | Dual <br> Enrollment <br> Recipients |  | 99\% | 99\% | 99\% | 99\% | 99\% | NA |
|  | TELS Recipients* |  | 62\% | 63\% | 63\% | 64\% | 63\% | 64\% |
| Adjusted Gross Income |  | \$12000 or less | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | 7\% | NA |
|  |  | 12,001-24,000 | 8\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% | 10\% | NA |
|  |  | 24,001-36,000 | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | NA |
|  | Dual | 36,001-48,000 | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | NA |
|  | Enrollment | 48,001-60,000 | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | NA |
|  | Recipients | 60,001-72,000 | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | NA |
|  |  | 72,001-84,000 | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | NA |
|  |  | 84,001-96,000 | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | NA |
|  |  | over \$96,000 | 28\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | 29\% | NA |
|  | TELS Recipients* | \$12000 or less | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 6\% | 7\% | 8\% |
|  |  | 12,001-24,000 | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% | 10\% |
|  |  | 24,001-36,000 | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% |
|  |  | 36,001-48,000 | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% |
|  |  | 48,001-60,000 | 11\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% | 9\% |
|  |  | 60,001-72,000 | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
|  |  | 72,001-84,000 | 10\% | 10\% | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% |
|  |  | 84,001-96,000 | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% |
|  |  | over \$96,000 | 26\% | 29\% | 32\% | 33\% | 34\% | 31\% |

Notes: Excludes students with missing data by category; NA = Not Available.
The 2010 cohort of Dual Enrollment Grant recipients still may have students enrolled in high school because both juniors \& seniors are eligible.

* TELS recipients include: HOPE, GAMS, ASPIRE, and ACCESS

One finding, not heretofore discovered, is that virtually all Dual Enrollment Grant recipients come from families where at least one parent has a college education. This compares to TELS recipients at large, where the share of scholarship recipients from such families is still high (two-thirds), but far below the percentage for Dual Enrollment grantees. This finding supports previous research that there is a relationship between parental educational attainment and postsecondary academic preparation.

Because middle- and low-income and minority students are traditionally underrepresented in higher education, these populations' healthy representation in the Dual Enrollment Grant program is encouraging from a state perspective. For example, the program offers a low-cost option (both for the state and the students) for these underrepresented students to explore their postsecondary options. This exploratory process may allow students with limited prior knowledge of postsecondary education to determine what type of postsecondary institution is an appropriate fit for pursuing their educational and occupational goals.

## Academic Preparation

In order to participate in the Dual Enrollment Grant program, students are required to meet the admissions criteria specific to Dual Enrollment Grant students at the postsecondary institution they attend. ${ }^{11}$ To take more than one course per semester, students must meet the HOPE scholarship eligibility criteria ( 3.0 high school GPA or 21 ACT). While their admission to a postsecondary institution suggests that these students are academically prepared to succeed in college, this conclusion is further corroborated by their high school academic performance.

Table 4 shows that the level of high school academic performance of Dual Enrollment Grant recipients largely mirrors the high school academic performance of TELS recipients. However, the groups differ on two likely related measures: the percentage of students meeting both HOPE scholarship eligibility criteria and the percentage of students taking at least one remedial and developmental (also referred to as "learning support") course. Additionally, on average, Dual Enrollment Grant recipients' high school GPA is higher than that of their TELS counterparts.

Previous research has shown that TELS recipients meeting both eligibility criteria progress and graduate with the scholarship intact at a higher rate than students meeting just one of the criteria (Tennessee Higher Education Commission, 2011a). Similarly, students that meet both criteria maintain a higher college GPA than students that only met one of the eligibility criteria. While college GPA is not a holistic measure of academic preparedness, there is an intuitive relationship between the two, and it represents THEC's best proxy.

[^4]Furthermore, the table shows that fewer Dual Enrollment Grant recipients need remediation compared to the TELS population, providing additional evidence of their academic preparedness. Interestingly, the difference between the percentage of Dual Enrollment Grant and TELS students that meet both criteria ( 6 percentage points) and the difference in the percentage of students that need remediation/learning support (7 percentage points) is almost equal.

Table 4: Academic preparation of Dual Enrollment Grant students vs. TELS students since both programs' inception


Notes: Table represents unduplicated headcounts
Table excludes students with missing ACT or High School GPA data.
Only includes Dual Enrollment Students that have enrolled in a public postsecondary institution (or a private institution if they received a lottery scholarship) after they have graduated from High School

* TELS recipients include: HOPE, GAMS, ASPIRE, and ACCESS

Finally, more detailed presentations of Dual Enrollment Grant students' high school academic performances can be found in Figure B-1 and Figure B-2 in Appendix B. Figure B-1 shows the distribution of Dual Enrollment Grant recipients' weighted high school GPAs, and Figure B-2 presents the distribution of Dual Enrollment Grant recipients' composite ACT scores.

## Postsecondary Participation

Table 5 presents the college-going rates of Dual Enrollment Grant recipients by their cohort year, defined as the first year in which they received a Dual Enrollment Grant. The table shows that once a cohort has had adequate time to enroll, the percentage of recipients that goes on to enroll in postsecondary education reaches over 90 percent. Additionally, if THEC currently had the ability to check for out-of-state postsecondary participation, the rate may exceed 95 percent. ${ }^{12}$

The low college-going rate in 2009 is probably a product of the limited amount of time that has passed since these students began participation in the program. Technically, students in this cohort could have graduated high school as recently as spring of 2011. ${ }^{13}$ The college-going rates for this cohort likely will increase over time, which will be shown as THEC receives additional enrollment data for each academic year. ${ }^{14}$

Table 5:
College-going rate of Dual Enrollment Grant recipients by cohort year

| Dual Enrollment <br> cohort academic <br> year | Beginning Cohort | Enrolled in a TN post- <br> secondary institution* as <br> of the 2010-11 academic <br> year | College- <br> going Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2005-06$ | 5270 | 4896 | $92.9 \%$ |
| $2006-07$ | 7335 | 6726 | $91.7 \%$ |
| $2007-08$ | 9111 | 7577 | $83.2 \%$ |
| $2008-09$ | 10470 | 8701 | $83.1 \%$ |
| $2009-10$ | 10691 | 6305 | $59.0 \%$ |
| Total | 42877 | 34205 | $79.8 \%$ |

${ }^{\circ}$ Excludes students with missing data

* Analysis is limited to students that were enrolled by the 2010 academic year at a TN public institution or students enrolled at a TN private institution that received a lottery scholarship. The 2010 cohort is not included, because part of the cohort may not have graduated from high school yet.

[^5]Table 6 shows where these students are enrolling by postsecondary education system after they graduate from high school. The enrollment distribution of grant recipients once they have left high school does not follow the same pattern as their enrollment while they participated in the program. Specifically, the distribution is more evenly distributed across sectors, with 25 percent of students choosing to enroll at a community college, compared to 66 percent while they were participating in the program (see Table 2). The enrollment distribution of Grant recipients once they enrolled in college after graduating from high school is more similar to the distribution of TELS recipients. Given the similarity of Dual Enrollment Grant recipients' high school academic performance relative to TELS recipients, it seems reasonable to expect these distributions to be similar.

Table 6:
Distribution of Dual Enrollment Grant recipients eventual postsecondary choices by system from 2005-06 to 2009-10

| System | Number of Students* | Percent | 2009-10 <br> TELS <br> Recipients |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | 8929 | $26 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
| TBR Community Colleges | 8453 | $25 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| UT Institutions | 9160 | $27 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| TICUA Institutions | 5498 | $16 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| TN Technology Centers | 2239 | $7 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Total | 34279 | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

* Total count of students does not equal count in Table 5, because some students were enrolled in multiple institutions in their first semester
${ }^{\circ}$ Source: (THEC, 2011a)

Table 7 displays the average credit hours attempted by Dual Enrollment Grant students in their first semester. ${ }^{15}$ Across all sectors, former Dual Enrollment Grant recipients on average took at least 12 hours, which is considered full-time. In fact, 99 percent of former Dual Enrollment Grant graduates at Tennessee public and private institutions were enrolled full-time during their first semester in college, defined as taking 12 or more credit hours. Furthermore, Dual Enrollment Grant recipients' attempted hours are similar to their TELS counterparts. However, recipients that enrolled in community colleges enrolled in fewer credits on average than their TELS counterparts.
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## Table 7:

Average credit hours attempted by former Dual Enrollment Grant recipients in their first semester* compared to TELS first-time freshmen (FTF) by system and cohort year

|  | Former Dual Enrollment Grant Recipients |  |  |  |  | TELS FTF |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2005-06$ | $2006-07$ | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ |
| TBR Universities | 14.5 | 14.5 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 14.3 | 14.4 |
| TBR Community Colleges | 10.7 | 10.4 | 12.2 | 12.1 | 11.9 | 12.9 |
| UT Institutions | 14.1 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 14.6 | 14.6 | 14.9 |
| TICUA Institutions | 14.9 | 14.3 | 15.0 | 15.1 | 15.1 | 15.2 |
| Average | 13.3 | 13.1 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 13.9 | 14.4 |

*Dual Enrollment Grant students' postsecondary cohorts are defined by the fall semester following the year they graduated from high school

## Postsecondary Progression \& Success

Table 8 shows how successfully Dual Enrollment Grant students have progressed in college. Specifically, the table shows the percentage of recipients that accumulated at least $24,48,72$, or 96 credit hours ${ }^{16}$ by 2010-11, starting with the most recent dual enrollment cohort year. Eight out ten Dual Enrollment Grant recipients accumulate 48 credits, which is equivalent to finishing two years of college. Additionally, over sixty percent finished the equivalent of four years of college. Dual Enrollment Grant recipients are progressing through college at high rates, and the rates have remained consistent across cohort years. These consistent high progression rates provide additional evidence of the high level of high school academic preparation of Dual Enrollment Grant students.

Table 9 shows that, in addition to their high progression rates, Dual Enrollment Grant students are maintaining above-average college GPAs after accumulating 24 credit hours. The average GPA of these students is well above the required 2.75 for renewal of TELS scholarships. As with the progression rates, the average GPA has remained consistent across systems and cohort years.

[^7]Table 8:
Percentage of former Dual Enrollment Grant recipients completing at least $24,48,72$, and 96 hours by 2010-11 by system and cohort year

|  | Accumulated at Least 24 hours |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| TBR Universities | $92 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $87 \%$ |
| TBR Community Colleges | $77 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $76 \%$ | $76 \%$ |
| UT Institutions | $94 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| TICUA Institutions | $92 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $67 \%^{*}$ |
| Total | $88 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $87 \%$ | $82 \%^{*}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Accumulated at Least 48 hours |  |  |  |
| TBR Universities | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| TBR Community Colleges | $85 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $80 \%$ | NA |
| UT Institutions | $63 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $58 \%$ | NA |
| TICUA Institutions | $89 \%$ | $88 \%$ | $85 \%$ | NA |
| Total | $86 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $73 \%^{*}$ | NA |


| Accumulated at Least 72 hours |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| TBR Universities | 77\% | 75\% | NA | NA |
| TBR Community Colleges | 47\% | 45\% | NA | NA |
| UT Institutions | 83\% | 80\% | NA | NA |
| TICUA Institutions | 79\% | 70\%* | NA | NA |
| Total | 71\% | 67\%* | NA | NA |
| Accumulated at Least 96 hours |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| TBR Universities | 71\% | NA | NA | NA |
| TBR Community Colleges | 36\% | NA | NA | NA |
| UT Institutions | 75\% | NA | NA | NA |
| TICUA Institutions | 68\%* | NA | NA | NA |
| Total | 62\%* | $N A$ | $N A$ | $N A$ |

Notes: NA = Not Available
*THEC currently does not have Spring 2010 enrollment data for TICUA institutions, which affects these percentages. Students that received an associate's degree that did not pursue a bachelor's degree may not be included in the numerator of the community college counts for the number of students accumulating 72 or 96 hours, making their percentages lower than they should be.

Table 9:
Average GPA of former Dual Enrollment Grant recipients by cohort year in the semester that they passed 24 earned credit hours

|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| TBR Community Colleges | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| UT Institutions | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.1 |
| TICUA Institutions | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.5 |
| Total | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.2 |

## Lottery Scholarship Participation \& Progression

Table 10 presents the counts and percentage of Dual Enrollment Grant students that eventually received a TELS scholarship, by their cohort year. Across all cohort years, 93 percent of Dual Enrollment Grant students that enrolled in a postsecondary institution received a TELS scholarship. These findings closely mirror the percentage of Dual Enrollment Grant students that were estimated to be lottery-eligible using weighted high school GPAs and composite ACT scores in the Academic Preparation section.

Additionally, the percentage has increased incrementally every year since the inception of the Dual Enrollment Grant program. This growth has occurred as the number of students qualifying has also increased. These trends suggest that the growth in the Dual Enrollment Grant population has not come at the cost of the level of academic preparation of Dual Enrollment Grant students. ${ }^{17}$

[^8]Table 10: Percentage of former Dual Enrollment Grant recipients that received TELS* by cohort year

| Dual Enrollment <br> Cohort Year | Beginning <br> Cohort $^{\circ}$ | Lottery <br> Recipients | \% Received <br> Lottery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | 4306 | 3882 | $90 \%$ |
| 2006 | 5975 | 5488 | $92 \%$ |
| 2007 | 7374 | 6894 | $93 \%$ |
| 2008 | 8473 | 7946 | $94 \%$ |
| Total | 26128 | 24210 | $93 \%$ |

* Includes: HOPE, GAMS, ACCESS, \& ASPIRE
${ }^{\circ}$ Differences in cohort counts from Table 5 are because TTC counts are not included

Table 11 presents the distribution of Dual Enrollment Grant students that received a lottery scholarship by TELS program. Compared to TELS first-time freshmen (FTF) in 2010, Dual Enrollment Grant students are overrepresented in the percentage of students who qualified for the General Assembly Merit Scholarship (GAMS) program. One of the original intents of the GAMS program was to incentivize Tennessee's best and brightest students to enroll in a postsecondary institution within the State by providing eligible students with an additional $\$ 1,000$ supplement on top of the HOPE base award amount.

Table 11: Distribution of Dual Enrollment Grant students that received TELS, by scholarship program compared to 2010-11 TELS first-time freshmen (FTF)

|  | Former Dual Enrollment Grant Recipients |  | TELS FTF |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2005-06$ | $2006-07$ | $2007-08$ | $2008-09$ | $2010-11$ |
| HOPE | $66.7 \%$ | $67.4 \%$ | $67.6 \%$ | $66.9 \%$ | $66 \%$ |
| GAMS | $9.2 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| ASPIRE | $23.6 \%$ | $23.9 \%$ | $23.7 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| ACCESS | $0.4 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Note: FTF = First-time Freshmen |  |  |  |  |  |

In order to qualify for GAMS, a student must have a minimum 3.75 high school GPA and a 29 composite ACT score. The success of the Dual Enrollment Grant program in attracting GAMSeligible students may present an opportunity for institutions to leverage the program in order to attract Tennessee's academically highest performing students to remain at their institution and in Tennessee. Future research is needed to examine how institutions are currently
integrating and utilizing the Dual Enrollment Grant program to meet their enrollment and completion goals.

Just as Dual Enrollment Grant students' higher level of academic preparation resulted in higher persistence rates, Table 12 shows that the same trends occur for scholarship renewal. The average renewal rates for Dual Enrollment Grant students were 10 percentage points higher than the renewal rates of their 2009 TELS FTF peers, with differences between the two groups concentrated within the HOPE and ASPIRE scholarship programs.

Table 12: $2^{\text {nd }}$ year TELS renewal rates for Dual Enrollment Grant recipients compared to 2009 TELS FTF by cohort year

|  | Former Dual Enrollment Grant Recipients |  | TELS FTF |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2005-06$ | $2006-07$ | $2007-08$ | $2009-10$ |
| HOPE | $64 \%$ |  |  | $55 \%$ |
| GAMS | $91 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $91 \%$ |
| ASPIRE | $55 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| ACCESS | $18 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $65 \%$ | $66 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $54 \%$ |

Note: FTF = First-Time Freshman

The differences in the scholarship renewal rates among Dual Enrollment Grant and traditional students that qualify for ASPIRE raise interesting questions, such as: What are the characteristics of low-Income Dual Enrollment Grant students that are associated with their retention of the scholarship at a higher rate than TELS low-income students? Is there a positive relationship between exposure to college classes while in high school for low-income students and scholarship renewal? And, are there institutional best practices that are contributing to this success?

## Section Summary

The Dual Enrollment Grant program's enrollment has almost tripled since its inception in 2005 (see Table 1). The high school academic characteristics of the Grant recipients show that the recipients are high achieving and well prepared for their postsecondary experience. Furthermore, recipients that enroll in a postsecondary institution following graduation from high school progress towards, and graduate with, their degree at high rates. However, participation in the program appears to be largely related to the students' proximity to a postsecondary institution. Recent legislation passed by the Tennessee General Assembly in 2012 Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship Special Report | 24

2010 (SB2008) will allow recipients to take more classes while they are participating in the program, potentially shortening their time-to-degree.

## HOPE FOSTER CARE GRANT

Implemented in 2005, the HOPE Foster Care Grant is funded by net proceeds from the Tennessee Education Lottery Corporation. The grant program provides financial assistance for students that have ever been foster children of the State. A foster child is defined by the State as a child who was in the custody of the Tennessee Department of Children's Services (DCS) for at least one year:

- after turning 14 years old; or
- after turning 14 years old and placed for adoption by DCS or one of its adoption contract agencies and the adoption was finalized; or
- after turning 14 years old was placed in permanent guardianship by DCS.

At eligible public postsecondary institutions, the grant program pays all tuition and mandatory fees less any gift aid. ${ }^{18}$ At an eligible independent institution, the grant is limited to the statewide average tuition and mandatory fees for a public four-year or two-year institution. Students may continue to receive that grant for a period of six years from admittance to an eligible postsecondary institution if satisfactory progress is made in a course of study in accordance with the standards and practices used for Title IV programs by the postsecondary institution in which the student is currently enrolled.

## Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible ${ }^{19}$ to participate in the HOPE Foster Care Grant program, a student must meet all the following eligibility criteria:

- Tennessee resident;
- Earned a high school diploma or equivalent;
- Enroll in an eligible postsecondary institution and apply for the grant no more than four (4) years after the graduation from high school or equivalent;
- Present the Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation (TSAC) with official certification from the DCS that the student meets the eligibility requirement for the grant; and
- Meet the minimum HOPE and HOPE Access grant eligibility requirements. ${ }^{20}$

[^9]
## Program History

Table 13 presents the number of students served and the total dollars awarded since the program's inception. Since its inception in 2005, the HOPE Foster Care Grant program has served 123 students ${ }^{21}$ at a total cost of $\$ 618,737$. The number of first-time students participating in the program has fluctuated, with the program's first year having the highest participation until 2010, the most recent academic year of available data. On average, the program enrolls 21 new students a year.

Table 13: HOPE Foster Care Grant Recipients and Dollars Awarded
2005-06 to 2010-2011

| Academic <br> Year | Students <br> Served $^{\circ}$ | Distinct Count <br> of Students <br> Served* | Average <br> Award per <br> Student $\dagger$ | Total Dollars <br> Awarded $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2005-06$ | 29 | 29 | $\$ 2,985$ | $\$ 86,558$ |
| $2006-07$ | 17 | 12 | $\$ 2,036$ | $\$ 34,604$ |
| $2007-08$ | 14 | 10 | $\$ 2,288$ | $\$ 32,035$ |
| $2008-09$ | 21 | 15 | $\$ 4,171$ | $\$ 87,596$ |
| $2009-10$ | 30 | 18 | $\$ 4,212$ | $\$ 126,360$ |
| $2010-11$ | 51 | 39 | $\$ 4,933$ | $\$ 251,584$ |
| Total | 162 | 123 | $\$ 3,819$ | $\$ 618,737$ |

Source: Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation (TSAC)
${ }^{\circ}$ Students counts are unduplicated within each year, but there are duplications across years

* Unduplicated count within and across years
† Calculated using Total Students Served


## Background Characteristics

Table 14 presents the demographic characteristics of recipients of the HOPE Foster Grant compared to TELS recipients and students enrolled at a Tennessee public institution. The table shows that recipients of the HOPE Foster Grant program are more than twice as likely to be female than male. Recipients are also almost twice as likely as TELS students to identify as an ethnic minority. According to Table B-1 in Appendix B, 43 percent of all recipients are Caucasian females.

However, it is not clear how the gender and racial distributions of the grant recipients compare to the gender and racial distributions of all eligible foster children in Tennessee. If certain students in the program are overrepresented by gender or race compared to all eligible foster students, then numerous questions are raised. For example, why are Caucasian female

[^10]students more likely to take part in the program than other groups? Are there successful interventions or best practices that can be identified and learned from? Or, what are the factors related to underrepresented students' decisions not to accept these educational benefits?

## Table 14:

Demographics of 2005-2010 Foster Grant recipients compared to FTF TELS recipients* since inception

|  |  | Foster Grant Students - Since Inception | TELS Students* <br> - Since Inception |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Female | 71\% | 60\% |
|  | Male | 29\% | 40\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| Race | African American | 30\% | 10\% |
|  | Caucasian | 63\% | 85\% |
|  | Other | 7\% | 5\% |
|  |  |  |  |
| Pell Eligible ${ }^{\circ}$ | Yes | 100\% | 34\% |
|  | No | 0\% | 66\% |
| Notes: <br> * TELS recipients include: HOPE, GAMS, ASPIRE, and ACCESS <br> ${ }^{\circ}$ Excludes students that did not fill out a FAFSA <br> FTF = first-time freshman |  |  |  |

## Academic Preparation

The social, cultural, economic, and educational challenges that foster children face should not be understated. Additionally, many of the challenges these students face are due to circumstances outside of their control. Given these realities, the high school academic performance of Grant recipients is impressive (see Table 15).

On average, recipients' composite ACT score was above the state average (19.5), and their average high school GPA was above a 3.0 (ACT, 2011). Despite the positive academic performance of these students, there are obvious differences between the level of preparation between Foster Grant recipients and TELS recipients. For example, Foster Grant recipients are more likely to need remediation/learning support and are less likely to meet both TELS eligibility criteria, a strong predictor of postsecondary success (THEC, 2011a).

Table 15: Academic preparation of Foster Care Grant students
vs. TELS students since both programs' inception

|  | Foster Care Grant Recipients | TELS* <br> Recipients |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average High School GPA | 3.25 | 3.42 |
| Average Composite ACT Score | 21 | 23 |
| \% Meeting at least one TELS Qualification | 87\% | 100\% |
| \% Meeting <br> both TELS Qualifications | 29\% | 60\% |
| Of students that would/did Qualify For TELS, \% Qualifying for HOPE | 87\% | 92\% |
| Of students that would/did Qualified For TELS, \% Qualify for GAMS | 0\% | 8\% |
| \% Taking at least one Remedial or Developmental Learning Support Course | 32\% | 19\% |
|  |  |  |

* TELS recipients include: HOPE, GAMS, ASPIRE, and ACCESS

Notes: 1) Table represents unduplicated headcounts
2)Table excludes students with missing ACT or High School GPA data.

## Postsecondary Participation

As shown in Table 16, Foster Care Grant recipients are primarily concentrated in public fouryear institutions. When comparing the percentage of recipients enrolling at TBR and UT universities, the distribution is almost equal when accounting for the number of institutions in each system. Foster Care Grant recipients' propensity to enroll in public four-year institutions may be driven by the award amount of the grant. The grant amount covers the full tuition and mandatory fees at a public four-year institution. However, at a private institution the grant amount is limited to the average of the state's public four- or two-year institutions, leaving the student with the responsibility of funding the balance.

Table 16:
Distribution of Foster Care Grant recipients by system in their first postsecondary semester, from 2005-06 to 2010-11

| System | Foster Grant recipients | TELS recipients |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | $43 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| TBR Community Colleges | $29 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| UT Institutions | $20 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| TICUA Institutions | $8 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

## Postsecondary Progression \& Success

Table 17 shows that Foster Care Grant recipients are attempting fewer credit hours in their first semester than TELS first-time freshmen and first-time freshmen at Tennessee public institutions in 2010. Despite taking fewer hours, on average Foster Care Grant recipients are enrolled fulltime ${ }^{22}$, and are attempting enough hours to earn their degrees in less than 150 percent of normal time. ${ }^{23}$

Table 17:
Average credit hours attempted by Foster Care Grant recipients in their first semester, by System

|  | Foster Grant <br> Average credit <br> hours attempted | 2010 TELS FTF <br> average credit <br> hours attempted | 2010 TN Public FTF <br> average credit hours <br> attempted |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | 12.7 | 14.4 | 13.8 |
| TBR Community Colleges | 10.4 | 12.4 | 11.0 |
| UT System | 13.3 | 14.6 | 14.2 |
| TICUA Institutions | 15.3 | 15.3 | 15.2 |
| Average Across Systems | 12.4 | 14.4 | 12.8 |

[^11]2012 Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship Special Report | 30

Table 18 presents the percent of Foster Care Grant recipients that accumulated 24, 48, 72, and 96 credit hours. On average, less than half of Foster Care Grant recipients accumulate 48 credit hours, which the equivalent of finishing two years of college taking 12 hours a semester. Less than a third of grant recipients finished the equivalent of four years of college. The low number of grant recipients reaching these progression marks highlights the need for additional student support services for Grant recipients.

Table 18:
By cohort year and by system, the percent of Foster Care Grant recipients that completed at least 24, $48,72,96$ credit hours

| Accumulated at Least 24 hours |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| TBR Universities | 71\% | 80\% | 100\% | 50\% | 75\% |
| TBR Community Colleges | 75\% | 0\% | * | 100\% | 17\% |
| UT System | 100\% | 0\% | 50\% | 50\% | 50\% |
| TICUA Institutions | * | 100\% | 25\% | 0\% | * |
| Total | 76\% | 42\% | 56\% | 57\% | 50\% |
| Accumulated at Least 48 hours |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| TBR Universities | 57\% | 80\% | 67\% | 33\% | NA |
| TBR Community Colleges | 50\% | 0\% | * | 75\% | NA |
| UT System | 100\% | 0\% | 50\% | 50\% | NA |
| TICUA Institutions | * | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | NA |
| Total | 59\% | 42\% | 33\% | 43\% | NA |
| Accumulated at Least 72 hours |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| TBR Universities | 57\% | 60\% | 67\% | NA | NA |
| TBR Community Colleges | 25\% | 0\% | * | NA | NA |
| UT System | 67\% | 0\% | 50\% | NA | NA |
| TICUA Institutions | * | 100\% | 0\% | NA | NA |
| Total | 45\% | 33\% | 33\% | NA | NA |
| Accumulated at Least 96 hours |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 |
| TBR Universities | 50\% | 60\% | NA | NA | NA |
| TBR Community Colleges | 25\% | 0\% | NA | NA | NA |
| UT System | 33\% | 0\% | NA | NA | NA |
| TICUA Institutions | * | 100\% | NA | NA | NA |
| Total | 38\% | 33\% | NA | NA | NA |

Notes: The percentages represent small N's
NA = Not Applicable. This denotes that these cohorts have not had sufficient time to accumulate the stated number of hours (assuming 12 hours a semester from the first semester of enrollment)

* means no students were originally part of the cohort at this system
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Table 19 shows the 6 -year graduation rate for the 2005 Foster Care Grant recipient cohort. Of the 29 students that participated in the program, only 10 ( 34 percent) graduated with an associate's or bachelor's degree within six years. In comparison, the six-year graduation rate of TELS 2005 first-time freshmen was 52 percent ${ }^{24}$, and the six-year graduation rate for Tennessee first-time freshmen enrolled at public institutions for the same cohort year was 47 percent. ${ }^{25}$

Examined together, Tables 17,18 , and 19 provide a picture of Foster Care Grant recipients' academic behavior in college. Recipients of the Grant begin their college experience taking fewer classes than their peers, and do not progress at the same rate; as a result, fewer graduate within six years. Further research is needed to identify factors that are predictive of Foster Grant students' dropout and success. For example, do Foster Care Grant recipients that attempt more hours in their first semester progress at a higher rate than students that take fewer hours? Or, are the attrition patterns different across ethnic and gender groups? If so, how can this information inform institutional support services?

Table 19:
2005-06 Hope Foster Care Grant recipients that graduated within 6years with an Associate's or Bachelor's degree
Beginning Cohort Number of Graduates 6-year Graduation Rate
$29 \quad 10$ 34\%

## Section Summary

Since the program's inception, the Hope Foster Care Grant has served 123 foster children, an average of 21 new students a year. Recipients of the Grant are academically less prepared than their TELS counterparts; however, their average composite ACT score (21) was above the state average (19.5). Recipients are also more likely to need remedial and developmental/learning support, take fewer credit hours, and drop out at higher rates. Given the challenges these students have faced personally and academically, additional support services would likely be needed to increase their postsecondary success.
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## HELPING HEROES GRANT

The Helping Heroes Grant, funded by net proceeds from the Tennessee Education Lottery Corporation, provides financial assistance for eligible veteran students ${ }^{26}$ in Tennessee. Implemented in 2008 and funded on a first-come, first-served basis, the program provides $\$ 1,000$ per semester for recipients that successfully complete 12 or more credit hours and $\$ 500$ per semester for recipients that successfully complete 6 to 11 credit hours in a semester at an eligible postsecondary institution. Students that complete less than 6 hours in a semester are not eligible for the grant. The grant is awarded retroactively as students pass their courses. ${ }^{27}$

Recipients may receive the award until one of the following events occurs:

- Recipient earns a bachelor's degree;
- Recipient receives the grant for eight full semesters, defined as 12 hours or more. Completion of 6-11 hours constitutes $1 / 2$ a semester; or
- Recipient has reached the eighth anniversary of the veteran's honorable discharge from military service.


## Eligibility Requirements

Unlike the other TELS scholarship programs, Helping Heroes grants are awarded on a firstcome, first-served basis. To be eligible ${ }^{28}$ for a Helping Heroes grant, a student must:

- Be a Tennessee resident
- Be a honorably discharged veteran, or a former or current member of a reserve or Tennessee National Guard unit that was called into active military service
- Be awarded the following: Iraq Campaign Medal; Afghanistan Campaign Medal; or Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, on or after September 11, 2001
- Enroll at an eligible institution
- Have not earned a bachelor's degree
- Not be in default on a federal Title IV educational loan
- Not owe a refund on a federal Title IV or Tennessee student financial aid program
- Be in compliance with federal drug-free rules and laws for receiving financial assistance
- Not be incarcerated
- Not be required to meet any academic standard at the time of enrollment

[^13]
## Program History

Table 20 presents the number of students served and the total dollars awarded since the program's inception. Since 2008, 815 students ${ }^{29}$ have participated in the program. While the number of eligible veterans in the State is unknown, the number of military and National Guard personnel present in Tennessee suggests that many eligible veterans are not taking advantage of the grant program.

Table 20: Helping Heroes Grant Recipients and Dollars Awarded
2008-09 to 2010-2011

| Academic <br> Year | Total Students <br> Served $^{\circ}$ | Unduplicated <br> Student <br> Count $^{*}$ | Average <br> Award per <br> Student $^{\dagger}$ | Total Dollars <br> Awarded $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2008-09$ | 260 | 267 | $\$ 1,406$ | $\$ 365,614$ |
| $2009-10$ | 367 | 234 | $\$ 1,398$ | $\$ 513,242$ |
| $2010-11$ | 503 | 314 | $\$ 1,352$ | $\$ 680,000$ |
| Total | 1130 | 815 | $\$ 1,380$ | $\$ 1,558,856$ |

Source: Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation (TSAC)
${ }^{\circ}$ Student counts include duplications

* Unduplicated count across years
† Calculated using Total Students Served

One of the reasons for the lack of participation may the robust financial aid package provided in the Post $9 / 11 \mathrm{GI}$ Bill, which allows veterans to attain a fully subsidized education. The Post 9/11 GI Bill covers the cost of tuition and fees (capped at the most expensive public undergraduate tuition in the state), a monthly housing stipend, and \$1,000 for books and supplies per year (US VA, 2008). Students that met the eligibility criteria for the Grant program and Post 9/11 GI Bill are in the rare position of having their financial need fully met.

Veterans participating in the Grant program offer researchers the opportunity to compare the effects of a holistic education benefits package on student success. Specifically, future research could compare students receiving both the comprehensive GI Bill and the Helping Heroes Grant with students that only receive the Helping Heroes Grant to determine the impact of full financial aid on veteran students' postsecondary success.

## Background Characteristics

Table 21 presents the background characteristics of Helping Heroes Grant recipients compared to all TELS recipients from 2008 to 2010. The table shows that while the gender distribution of

[^14]Table 21:
2008-2010 Helping Heroes Grant recipients' demographics compared to TELS recipients*

|  |  |  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Helping Heroes | Female | 19\% | 14\% | 12\% |
|  | Recipients | Male | 81\% | 86\% | 88\% |
|  | TELS Recipients* | Female | 59\% | 59\% | 59\% |
|  |  | Male | 41\% | 41\% | 41\% |
| Race | Helping Heroes Recipients | African American | 13\% | 12\% | 10\% |
|  |  | Caucasian | 76\% | 78\% | 80\% |
|  |  | Other | 11\% | 11\% | 10\% |
|  | TELS Recipients* | African American | 9\% | 10\% | 10\% |
|  |  | Caucasian | 86\% | 85\% | 84\% |
|  |  | Other | 4\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| \% with at least one parent with an Associate's degree or higher | Helping Heroes |  | 94\% | 92\% | 91\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TELS Recipients* |  | 64\% | 63\% | 64\% |
| Adjusted Gross Income | Helping Heroes Recipients | \$12000 or less | 29\% | 25\% | 26\% |
|  |  | 12,001-24,000 | 35\% | 20\% | 27\% |
|  |  | 24,001-36,000 | 18\% | 23\% | 13\% |
|  |  | 36,001-48,000 | 7\% | 10\% | 12\% |
|  |  | 48,001-60,000 | 7\% | 8\% | 5\% |
|  |  | 60,001-72,000 | 3\% | 3\% | 5\% |
|  |  | 72,001-84,000 | 1\% | 4\% | 4\% |
|  |  | 84,001-96,000 | 0\% | 1\% | 3\% |
|  |  | over \$96,000 | 1\% | 4\% | 5\% |
|  | TELS Recipients* | \$12000 or less | 6\% | 7\% | 8\% |
|  |  | 12,001-24,000 | 8\% | 8\% | 10\% |
|  |  | 24,001-36,000 | 9\% | 9\% | 10\% |
|  |  | 36,001-48,000 | 8\% | 8\% | 9\% |
|  |  | 48,001-60,000 | 9\% | 8\% | 9\% |
|  |  | 60,001-72,000 | 9\% | 9\% | 9\% |
|  |  | 72,001-84,000 | 9\% | 9\% | 8\% |
|  |  | 84,001-96,000 | 8\% | 8\% | 8\% |
|  |  | over \$96,000 | 33\% | 34\% | 31\% |

the armed services is becoming more equitable, participants in the grant program are predominantly male. Additionally, recipients are more likely to identify as an ethnic minority and be low-income than their TELS counterparts. However, 91 percent of recipients have at least one parent with an Associate's degree or higher compared to 64 percent for TELS recipients in the most recent year.

The high number of low-income students participating in the program compared to the TELS population probably can be attributed to two factors: 1) Grant recipients are independent students and their adjusted gross income is a reflection of their earnings, while TELS recipients' AGI is primarily a reflection of their parents' earnings. 2) One of the requirements of the grant is that recipients cannot have previously obtained a bachelor's degree, meaning recipients were noncommissioned officers and earned less than commissioned officers, whose requires a college degree.

The high percentage of grant recipients with at least one parent with an Associate's degree or higher provides further anecdotal evidence that the grant program is potentially underutilized. Traditionally, students that join the military without a college degree are more likely to be firstgeneration college students and from households with lower educational attainment (Watkins \& Sherk, 2008). The fact that almost all of the veterans participating in this program come from households that completed a postsecondary degree suggests that there may be a larger population of veterans within the State that would be classified as first-generation college students that are not taking advantage of the program.

## Academic Preparation

Table 22 presents measures of academic preparedness of Helping Heroes Grant recipients compared to TELS recipients since the inception of both programs. The table shows that Grant recipients are less prepared for the postsecondary experience than their TELS counterparts. Specifically, recipients are almost twice as likely to need remediation/learning support, and are less likely to meet the minimum qualifications for the HOPE scholarship program.

Recipients' average ACT score is slightly above the State average of 19.5, while their average GPA is below (3.15) for public high school graduates over the same period, 2008-10. ${ }^{30}$ While these findings may seem at odds with the high percentage of recipients with at least one parent with an associate's degree, these academic preparation indicators may be a better indicator of these students' interest and focus while in high school, rather than their scholastic aptitude.

[^15]Table 22: Academic preparation of Helping Heroes Grant recipients compared to TELS recipients since both programs' inception

|  | Helping Heroes Recipients (2008) | TELS* Recipients (2004) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average High School GPA | 2.81 | 3.42 |
| Average Composite ACT Score | 20 | 23 |
| \% Meeting at least one TELS Qualify | 20\% | 100\% |
| \% Meeting both TELS Qualify | 9\% | 60\% |
| Of students that would/did Qualified for TELS, \% Qualifying for HOPE | 20\% | 92\% |
| Of students that would/did Qualified for TELS, \% Qualifying for GAMS | 0\% | 8\% |
| \% Taking at least one Remedial \& Developmental Course | 34\% | 19\% |
| , |  |  |

* TELS recipients include: HOPE, GAMS, ASPIRE, and ACCESS

Notes: 1) Table represents unduplicated headcounts
2)Table excludes students with missing ACT or High School GPA data.

## Postsecondary Participation

Table $\mathbf{2 3}$ presents the distribution of Helping Heroes recipients compared to TELS recipients, by system, in their first semester from 2008-2010. While TELS recipients are more evenly distributed across Tennessee's higher education systems, grant recipients are overwhelmingly concentrated at TBR universities and community colleges. However, grant recipients' affinity for enrolling at TBR universities and community colleges may be explained by their high school academic performance and their limited financial resources.

Table 23:
Distribution of Helping Heroes Grant recipients by system in their first semester from 2008-2010

| System | Helping <br> Heroes \% | TELS recipients \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | $48 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| TBR Community Colleges | $45 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| UT Institutions | $7 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| TICUA Institutions | $<1 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

## Postsecondary Progression \& Success

Table 24 shows the average credit house attempted by Helping Heroes Grant recipients in their first semester in college by system. On average, grant recipients took fewer credit hours in their first semester than TELS first-time freshmen and first-time freshmen at Tennessee public institutions did in 2010. Despite taking fewer hours than their peers, recipients' average credit hours in their first semester started them on a trajectory to finish their degree within 150 percent of normal time.

Table 24:
Average credit hours attempted by Helping Heroes Grant recipients in their first semester by System

|  | Helping Heroes' <br> average credit hours <br> attempted | 2010 TELS FTF <br> average credit hours <br> attempted | 2010 TN Public FTF <br> average credit hours <br> attempted |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | 11.8 | 14.4 | 13.8 |
| TBR Community Colleges | 10.9 | 12.4 | 11.0 |
| UT Institutions | 13.2 | 14.6 | 14.2 |
| TICUA Institutions | 16.0 | 15.3 | 15.2 |
| Average Across Systems | 12.2 | 14.4 | 12.8 |

Helping Heroes Grant recipients are below average in preparation, and in the average number of credit hours they take in their first semester. Even so, Table 25 shows that the first two Helping Heroes cohorts are progressing at high rates. Additionally, their progression rates are relatively stable across postsecondary systems. Given that a high percentage of these students typically would be classified as an at-risk population (being low-income, or unprepared academically), their high success rates in college warrant further explanation.

For example, does having worked full-time prior to enrolling in college better prepare students to succeed in college? Or, are skills and behaviors developed during military training, such as discipline, organization, and preparation, primary contributors to their success? Simply, are there learned behaviors that are allowing recipients to progress at higher rates than other atrisk populations, and are these skills or behaviors transferrable?

Table 25:
Percentage of Helping Heroes Grant recipients that completed at least $24,48,72,96$ hours, by system and cohort year

| Accumulated at Least 24 hours |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 |
| TBR Universities | $100 \%$ | $96 \%$ |
| TBR Community Colleges | $93 \%$ | $86 \%$ |
| UT Institutions | $100 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| TICUA Institutions | NA | NA |
| Total | $97 \%$ | $91 \%$ |


| Accumulated at Least 48 hours |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2008 | 2009 |
| TBR Universities | $99 \%$ | NA |
| TBR Community Colleges | $83 \%$ | NA |
| UT Institutions | $93 \%$ | NA |
| TICUA Institutions | NA | NA |
| Total | $93 \%$ | NA |

Notes: NA = Not Applicable. For the 2009 cohort, this denotes that the cohort has not had sufficient time to accumulate 48 hours (assuming 12 hours a semester from the first semester of enrollment)

## Section Summary

The Helping Heroes Grant program has provided $\$ 1.5$ million in grants to 815 Tennessee veterans since 2008. The majority of Grant recipients come from households where at least one parent has an associate's degree or higher. Recipients are less academically prepared than their TELS counterparts, and are more likely to need remedial and developmental/learning support, which research suggests decreases their odds of persistence and degree completion. Despite their remediation needs, Grant recipients are persisting at high rates. Part of this success may be attributable to "military friendly" institutions ${ }^{31}$ focus on serving veteran students. These institutions' best practices should be examined to see if they are transferrable to at-risk students in other TELS programs.

[^16]
## MATH \& SCIENCE TEACHER LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM

Funded by net proceeds from the Tennessee Education Lottery Corporation, the Tennessee Math \& Science Teacher Loan Forgiveness Program provides financial assistance to Tennessee public school teachers seeking an advanced degree in a math or science, or a certification to teach math or a science. A qualifying Tennessee public school teacher can receive $\$ 2,000$ per academic year, and a maximum of $\$ 10,000$ for all years required for the teacher's program of study.

Program participants are eligible for forgiveness of one academic year's loans for every two years that the teacher is employed teaching math or science in a Tennessee public school system. Additionally, a borrower who completes the program of study for which a Math \& Science Teacher Loan was provided and who subsequently satisfies the terms of the loan in full, either through repayment or cancellation, is not prevented from participating in the Tennessee Math \& Science Teacher Loan Forgiveness Program again, in order to gain certification or an advanced degree in a different area of math or science.

## Eligibility Requirements

In order to be eligible ${ }^{32}$ for a Math \& Science Teacher Loan, a student must:

- Be a citizen of the United States and a resident of Tennessee;
- Attend an eligible postsecondary institution seeking an advanced degree in math or science or certification to teach math or a science; and
- Agree to teach math or a science in a Tennessee public school system two (2) academic years for each year funded; and
- Sign a promissory note that stipulates the cash repayment obligation incurred if the teaching service is not fulfilled; and
- Maintain satisfactory academic progress in the teacher's program of study with no minimum number of hours required per semester; and
- Complete the program of study within five (5) years beginning with the first term for which the loan was awarded; and
- Not allow a break in enrollment at an eligible postsecondary institution of more than twelve (12) months.
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## Program History

Table 26 presents the number of students served and the total dollars awarded since the program's inception. Since its inception, the Math \& Science Loan program has served 65 students ${ }^{33}$ at a total cost of $\$ 199,000$. The number of first-time students participating in the program has declined every year since the program began in 2007. In the most recent year, nine first-time recipients participated in the program.

Table 26: Math \& Science Loan Recipients and Dollars Awarded 2007-08 to 2010-2011

| Academic <br> Year | Students <br> Served $^{\circ}$ | Distinct Count <br> of Students <br> Served* | Average <br> Award per <br> Student + | Total Dollars <br> Awarded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2007-08$ | 31 | 30 | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 62,000$ |
| $2008-09$ | 29 | 16 | $\$ 1,862$ | $\$ 54,000$ |
| $2009-10$ | 25 | 10 | $\$ 1,880$ | $\$ 47,000$ |
| $2010-11$ | 18 | 9 | $\$ 2,000$ | $\$ 36,000$ |
| Total | 103 | 65 | $\$ 1,932$ | $\$ 199,000$ |

Source: Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation (TSAC)
${ }^{\circ}$ Students counts includes duplicates

* Unduplicated count within and across years
† Calculated using Total Students Served

Given the importance of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) jobs to the economic and workforce development priorities of the State (THEC, 2011b), the declining number of participants in the loan forgiveness program is not encouraging. Future research is needed to examine why participation is declining; however, in 2010 the amount of loans provided by the program to eligible students covered less than one third of the average tuition and fees for in-state graduate students at Tennessee public universities. ${ }^{34}$ In order to attract more qualified participants, the loan awards could be expanded to cover the full cost of tuition and mandatory fees at a Tennessee public university.

Assuming an annual cost of $\$ 7,498$ a year per student, the total cost of the program in academic year 2007-08, the year of the programs largest enrollment, would have been $\$ 232,438$. If the program tripled the number of participants since its inception, the total cost would have been $\$ 2,316,882$, an amount that is less than one percent of the total funding for all TELS programs in 2010.

[^18]
## Background Characteristics

Table 27 presents the demographics of recipients of the Math \& Science Teacher Loan Forgiveness program since its inception. The data suggest that a majority of the recipients are mid-career teachers seeking to improve their credentials, expertise, and teaching skills. Twothirds of recipients are females, who are traditionally underrepresented in STEM fields, but overrepresented in the teaching profession. The table also shows that over 15 percent of recipients have an adjusted gross income (AGI) over $\$ 96,000$. Given that 80 percent of recipients are over the age of thirty, the recipients in this category probably account for teachers that are married and filed their tax return jointly.

Table 27:
2007-2010 Math \& Science Teacher Loan recipients' demographics

|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | 2009 | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0}$ | Total |  |  |  |
| Race | Female | $59 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $61 \%$ |
|  | Male | $41 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $39 \%$ |
|  | African American | $0 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
|  | Caucasian | $97 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $78 \%$ | $89 \%$ |
|  | Other | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
|  |  |  | $21 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $33 \%$ |

Notes: Excludes students with missing data by category
AGI and Parent Education information is limited to students that filled out a FAFSA

## Postsecondary Participation

Table $\mathbf{2 8}$ presents the distribution of Math \& Science Loan recipients by system and degree level during their first semester enrolled in the program. Participants in the program are primarily pursuing a master's degree, and they are primarily concentrated at TBR universities.

Table 28:
Distribution of Math \& Science Loan recipients by system and degree level in their first semester from 2008-2010

|  | System | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | $79 \%$ |  |
| UT Institutions | Degree Level | $21 \%$ |
|  | Percent |  |
| Masters | $91 \%$ |  |
| Doctoral | $9 \%$ |  |

## Postsecondary Progression \& Success

Table 29 presents the average credit hours attempted by Math \& Science Teaching Loan Recipients in their first semester by system. Recipients' behavior is similar across systems, with recipients on average attending part-time during their first semester enrolled in the program. Recipients' average credit hours taken suggest that recipients may be working full-time while they are participating in the program. Supporting evidence can be found in Table 30, which shows the average earnings of recipients in their beginning year of the program.

Table 29:
Average credit hours attempted by Math \& Science
Teaching Loan recipients in their first semester by system

|  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | 5.5 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.5 |
| UT Institutions | 5.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Average Across Systems | 5.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 4.2 |

Table 30:
Average wages earned by Math \& Science Teaching Loan recipients in their cohort year

|  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | Average |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average <br> Wages | $\$ 36,125$ | $\$ 42,727$ | $\$ 43,776$ | $\$ 32,863$ | $\$ 37,458$ |

Source: UI Wage Data

Table 31 shows the percentage of 2007 recipients that graduated within three years ${ }^{35}$ with their master's degree. While, on average, recipients were enrolled part-time in their first semester in the program, over 60 percent of recipients graduated within three years. Additionally, because a majority of students are enrolled part-time, the percent of 2007 recipients that graduate with their degree likely will increase as additional time passes.

Table 31:
Count and percentage of 2007 Math \& Science Loan recipients that graduated within 3 years with a master's degree

| Beginning Cohort* | Number of Graduates | 3-year Graduation Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 | 17 | $63 \%$ |
| *Doctoral students are excluded, because they would not have had sufficient time to complete |  |  |

## Section Summary

Since its inception in 2007, the Math \& Science Teacher Loan Forgiveness program has served 65 students; however, enrollment of new students has declined every year. Loan recipients are typically working full-time and going to school part-time to pursue an advanced degree or certification in a math or science. Despite their part-time enrollment, over two-thirds of recipients are completing within three years, and the rate is likely to go up over time. Given the State's emphasis on teachers in STEM fields (THEC, 2011b), the declining participation in the program is disconcerting. Increasing the annual maximum loan amounts to cover the cost of tuition and mandatory fees at public universities may provide an incentive to reverse this trend.

[^19]
## RURAL HEALTH LOAN FORGIVENESS PROGRAM

The Rural Health Loan Forgiveness Program is a five-year pilot program funded by net proceeds from the Tennessee Education Lottery. It provides loans to future health care providers and dentists that agree to practice in a Tennessee health shortage area ${ }^{36}$ after receiving their license to practice. The pilot program began with the 2008-09 academic year and will enroll its last cohort of students in 2012-13. The number of awards is limited to twenty-five students for the beginning and ending years of the program, and fifty students for the middle three years.

The loan amount is capped at $\$ 12,000$ per academic year, or the cost of tuition, mandatory fees, books and equipment, whichever is less. In order to remain eligible to receive the award, students must maintain satisfactory progress in the program of study in which they are enrolled. Recipients are eligible for forgiveness of one year's loans for each year that they practice in a health resource shortage area after receiving their professional license.

## Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible ${ }^{37}$, a student must:

- Be a Tennessee resident
- Enroll and complete the program at an eligible institution by the end of spring 2013
- Not be in default on a federal Title IV educational loan or Tennessee educational loan;
- Not owe a refund on a federal Title IV or Tennessee student financial aid program;
- Not accept other financial aid that carries a service obligation ${ }^{38}$
- Sign a promissory note each year the loan is awarded stipulating the repayment obligation if service requirement is not met. All funds be repaid with interest at $9 \%$ per annum
- Be in compliance with federal drug-free rules and laws for receiving financial assistance;
- Be a full-time student pursuing a:
- Doctor of Medicine (M.D.) degree
- Doctor of Osteopathic Medicine (D.O.) degree
- Doctor of Dental Surgery (D.D.S.) degree
- Doctor of Dental Medicine (D.M.D.) degree
- Physician Assistant credential
- Nurse Practitioner credential

[^20]2012 Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship Special Report |

## Program History

Table 32 presents the number of students served and the total dollars loaned since the program's inception. Since 2008, the program has served 80 students $^{39}$ at a total cost of $\$ 1,272,767$. In the program's first year, the maximum number of students enrolled (25), suggesting great interest in a loan forgiveness program that would serve Tennessee's health shortage areas. However, despite the growth in the number of total students served since 2008-09, the program's enrollment continues to decline as a percentage of its allowable capacity. For example, by 2010-11 the program's capacity was 125 students, however, there were only 80 students participating in the program.

Table 32: Rural Health Loan recipients and dollars awarded 2008-09 to 2010-2011

| Academic <br> Year | Total Students <br> Served | Unduplicated <br> Student Count* $^{*}$ | Average <br> Award per $^{\text {Student }}{ }^{\dagger}$ | Total Dollars <br> Awarded $\dagger$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2008-09$ | 25 | 25 | $\$ 10,952$ | $\$ 273,806$ |
| $2009-10$ | 50 | 32 | $\$ 10,358$ | $\$ 517,912$ |
| $2010-11$ | 45 | 23 | $\$ 10,690$ | $\$ 481,049$ |
| Total | 120 | 80 | $\$ 10,606$ | $\$ 1,272,767$ |

Source: Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation (TSAC)
${ }^{\circ}$ Student counts include duplications across years

* Unduplicated count across years
† Calculated using Total Students Served


## Background Characteristics

Table 33 shows the background characteristics of Rural Health loan recipients from 2008-2010. Of all the programs included in the study, the Rural Health Loan Forgiveness program had the highest percentage of missing data. ${ }^{40}$ As a result, some of the categories and their percentages in the table represent small numbers, which can cause percentages to vary over time without much change occurring. Given these considerations, recipients of the program are predominately female, Caucasian, and come from well-educated families. Over the three cohorts, however, there has been increased minority participation in the program.

[^21]Table 33:
2008-2010 Rural Health Loan recipients' demographics

|  |  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Female | 83\% | 76\% | 90\% | 83\% |
|  | Male | 17\% | 24\% | 10\% | 17\% |
| Race | African American | 0\% | 10\% | 20\% | 10\% |
|  | Caucasian | 100\% | 90\% | 75\% | 88\% |
|  | Other | 0\% | 0\% | 5\% | 2\% |
| \% with at least one parent with an Associate's degree or higher |  | 83\% | 81\% | 89\% | 84\% |
| Adjusted Gross Income | \$12000 or less | 17\% | 14\% | 0\% | 11\% |
|  | 12,001-24,000 | 0\% | 14\% | 22\% | 12\% |
|  | 24,001-36,000 | 28\% | 5\% | 6\% | 12\% |
|  | 36,001-48,000 | 11\% | 0\% | 11\% | 7\% |
|  | 48,001-60,000 | 17\% | 10\% | 6\% | 11\% |
|  | 60,001-72,000 | 6\% | 29\% | 0\% | 12\% |
|  | 72,001-84,000 | 6\% | 0\% | 17\% | 7\% |
|  | 84,001-96,000 | 6\% | 14\% | 0\% | 7\% |
|  | over \$96,000 | 11\% | 14\% | 39\% | 21\% |

Notes: Excludes students with missing data by category

## Postsecondary Participation

Table 34 presents the distribution of Rural Health loan recipients by academic year and system since its inception. Overwhelmingly, recipients of the loans are enrolled in TICUA institutions. What is not known, and what future research should explore, is the kind of programs and degrees the loan recipients are pursuing. ${ }^{41}$ For example, are these students primarily enrolled in Doctor of Medicine degree programs, or are the majority of recipients seeking to become a physician assistant? While all the programs have been identified as a priority for the state in Tennessee's health shortage areas, a distribution of recipients by degree program would allow policymakers to understand how the current pilot program is being utilized.
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Table 34: Distribution of Rural Health loan recipients
by system and academic year

|  | $2008-09$ | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TBR Universities | $4 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| UT Institutions | $8 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| TICUA Institutions | $88 \%$ | $74 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $79 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Source: TSAC (Represents duplicate counts across years) |  |  |  |  |

Source: TSAC (Represents duplicate counts across years)

## Postsecondary Progression \& Success

Due to the high percentage of missing data for the Rural Health program, postsecondary progression and success metrics are not provided.

## Section Summary

Started in 2008, the Rural Health Loan Forgiveness Program is a five-year pilot program that provides loans to future health care providers and dentists that agree to practice in a Tennessee health shortage area after receiving their license to practice. The pilot program will enroll its last cohort of students in 2012-13. Since its inception, the program has provided financial support to 80 students at a cost of over $\$ 1.2$ million. Recipients of the program are predominately female and Caucasian, although there has been growth in the number of minority students participating. Insufficient time has passed to see what percentage of the cohort has completed their advanced degree.

## APPENDIX A: DATA LIMITATIONS

During the course of conducting the research for this report, several data issues were discovered, which are important to note and discuss. These data concerns range from missing data from institutions to a lack of congruence between THEC's Student Information System (SIS) and TSAC's e*GRandS database. ${ }^{42}$ As a result of the challenges encountered in the development of this report, several recommendations are made, which the authors believe will continue to build and strengthen THEC's ability to follow student success in these smaller lottery scholarship programs. The section begins with a summary of the recommendations and then outlines specific issues encountered during the analyses.

## Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Make e*GRandS the foundation for enrollment validation for THEC's TELS student data.

Adopting this recommendation would improve the accuracy of THEC's lottery student database and its reporting. e*GRandS is the actual payment record of the TELS programs and is extremely accurate, while THEC's current lottery student database relies on institutional reporting. While currently THEC receives snapshots from a limited number of tables in the $e^{*}$ GRandS database, a more managed approach to incorporating the e*GRandS database as part of THEC's SIS for lottery students should be considered. Additionally, it could reduce the reporting burden on the institutions and the systems, and prevent some data reporting errors from the systems through validation of TELS students. Examples of discrepancies between e*GRandS and THEC's SIS can be found in the Data Issues section below.

Recommendation 2: Collect students' Last Name, First Name, and Date of Birth from the institutions as a part of the enrollment data collection cycle.

Collecting students' first name, last name, and date of birth will allow THEC to use the National Student Clearinghouse to determine what percentage of Dual Enrollment Grant recipients is enrolling and completing postsecondary education out-of-state. ${ }^{43}$ Specifically, doing so would allow THEC to determine the amount of lottery dollars being spent on Dual Enrollment Grant students that leave the state. Additionally, it would allow THEC to report a more accurate graduation rate of students that begin their postsecondary education at a public institution in Tennessee.

Recommendation 3: Move student level records for all TELS programs into e*GRandS.

[^23]Currently, student level information for several of the smaller TELS programs are maintained in Excel files by TSAC. However, TSAC has already identified and has begun to move many of these programs over to the e*GRandS database in a phased-in approach. All programs should be moved into e*GRandS, even programs that have ended or are set to end in the near future.

## Data Issues and Resolutions

There were numerous data issues that proved to be a challenge for the analysis. When considered in isolation, none of these issues by themselves may seem limiting. However, the combined effect of these data issues was significant and concerning. The data issues can be grouped into two categories: missing data and data anomalies. The defined categories are not intended to be exhaustive, rather to present examples of some of the data anomalies discovered in the process.

## Missing Data

The issues here concern students that participated in TELS programs, but are completely missing from THEC's SIS when compared to TSAC records. The impact of these students can be seen in Table 35. The table presents the number of students participating in the Dual Enrollment Gant and Rural Health Loan Forgiveness programs by their cohort year (the first year they were in the program), the number that were in THEC's SIS, and the number and percentage missing. The table shows that over 25 percent of recipients of the Rural Health Loan Forgiveness program are missing from THEC's database. Equally concerning is the increasing percentage of students with missing data in the Dual Enrollment Grant with each new cohort. A cursory examination suggests that individuals enrolled in private institutions are more likely to be missing than their public counterparts.

To address the missing data, researchers attempted to gain this information through two sources: 1) TSAC was asked to provide last name, first name, and date of birth for the missing students when available. THEC sent a list of 83 students to the National Student Clearinghouse to obtain their enrollment information. Of these 83 students, the Clearinghouse was able to match 43 ( 52 percent), and the majority of matched records were enrolled in in-state private institutions. However, receiving a match does not mean that Clearinghouse showed enrollment for students during their time in the program. The match provided could have provided enrollment information for students at different institutions prior to their participation in a TELS program. 2) Missing students were matched on the public high school graduates database in THEC's SIS, which yielded an additional 480 matches. Of these 480 potential students, the Clearinghouse matched 287, the majority of which attended in-state private institutions.

Table 35: Count and percentage of students missing by TELS program

| Dual |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cnrollment Grant |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Year | \# of Students in Program | \# in THEC SIS | \# of Students Missing | \% Missing |
| 2005 | 5359 | 5270 | 89 | $2 \%$ |
| 2006 | 7462 | 7335 | 127 | $2 \%$ |
| 2007 | 9332 | 9111 | 221 | $2 \%$ |
| 2008 | 11483 | 10470 | 1013 | $9 \%$ |
| 2009 | 12302 | 10691 | 1611 | $13 \%$ |
| 2010 | 13747 | 11185 | 2562 | $19 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 9 6 8 5}$ | 54062 | $\mathbf{5 6 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Year | \# of Students in Program | \# in THEC SIS | \# of Students Missing | \% Missing |
| 2008 | 25 | 18 | 7 | $28 \%$ |
| 2009 | 32 | 21 | 11 | $34 \%$ |
| 2010 | 23 | 20 | 3 | $13 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ |

## Data Inconsistencies

While 90 percent of Dual Enrollment Grant students were represented in the database, the actual number of students correctly identified as Dual Enrollment Grant students in THEC's SIS was much lower (see Table 36). The table shows that only 26 percent of students were correctly identified, and the percentage is declining with each passing year. Additionally, another 1,335 Dual Enrollment Grant students' reported year of high school graduation was earlier than their participation in the program. It is important to note that inconsistencies were not limited to the Dual Enrollment Grant program rather, they were wide ranging.

Table 36: Percent of Dual Enrollment Grant students correctly coded in THEC's SIS

| Year | \# Correctly Coded in <br> THEC SIS | Total \# of Students | \% Coded Correctly |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | 2772 | 5359 | $52 \%$ |
| 2006 | 2903 | 7462 | $39 \%$ |
| 2007 | 3483 | 9332 | $37 \%$ |
| 2008 | 2542 | 11483 | $22 \%$ |
| 2009 | 1981 | 12302 | $16 \%$ |
| 2010 | 1580 | 13747 | $11 \%$ |
| Total | 15261 | 59685 | $26 \%$ |

One of the biggest challenges researchers faced during the course of the study was to identify the first semester that students were enrolled in the program and the institution that they attended. This proved especially challenging for the Dual Enrollment Grant Program. The THEC SIS does contain a flag denoting the term and year that a student is enrolled during their first semester at an institution. However, students enrolled while participating in the Dual Enrollment Grant program should not be coded with this identifier.

Figure 3 shows the average credit hours taken as a Dual Enrollment Grant student in the semester that they were flagged as a first-time freshman. Obviously and overwhelmingly, Dual Enrollment Grant students are being flagged as a first-time freshman while they are still participating in the program in high school. These inconsistencies are problematic because, defining a student's first semester, and the institution that they attended as a college student after graduating high school is essential for most postsecondary metrics.

Figure 3:
Distribution of credit hours attempted during first semester enrolled


It is worth repeating that the problems identified are not an exhaustive list of data issues, nor were these problems exclusive to the Dual Enrollment Grant and Rural Health Loan Forgiveness programs. For example, in both TELS programs serving graduate students, students were consistently not coded as graduate students in the year that they were enrolled in the program. Additionally, it was not uncommon for students from all programs to have reported high school graduation years prior to the 1900s. Finally, not collecting first name, last name, and date of birth, prevented the researchers from gathering out-of-state and non-public enrollment information within the state that could have enhanced the study's findings.

In summary, the data limitations impacted the report in tangible ways. First, they forced the researchers to deduce a student's first semester in college. Specifically, the descriptive statistics on students' enrollment and behavior in their first semester represents the researchers' best guess given the data limitations. And second, the data challenges encountered helped the researchers to identify areas of improvement going forward, some of which were included in the recommendations section.

## APPENDIX B: TABLES \& FIGURES

Table B-1:
County share of Dual Enrollment Grant participants since 2005

| County | Percent |
| :---: | :---: |
| ANDERSON | 1.2\% |
| BEDFORD | 0.9\% |
| BENTON | 0.4\% |
| BLEDSOE | 0.3\% |
| BLOUNT | 2.2\% |
| BRADLEY | 2.8\% |
| CAMPBELL | 0.7\% |
| CANNON | 0.2\% |
| CARROLL | 1.4\% |
| CARTER | 0.6\% |
| CHEATHAM | 1.3\% |
| CHESTER | 0.5\% |
| CLAIBORNE | 0.4\% |
| CLAY | 0.4\% |
| COCKE | 0.4\% |
| COFFEE | 1.2\% |
| CROCKETT | 0.4\% |
| CUMBERLAND | 1.2\% |
| DAVIDSON | 3.5\% |
| DECATUR | 0.3\% |
| DEKALB | 0.5\% |
| DICKSON | 1.5\% |
| DYER | 2.1\% |
| FAYETTE | 0.2\% |
| FENTRESS | 0.7\% |
| FRANKLIN | 0.5\% |
| GIBSON | 1.3\% |
| GILES | 0.7\% |
| GRAINGER | 0.4\% |
| GREENE | 1.4\% |
| GRUNDY | 0.1\% |
| HAMBLEN | 0.6\% |
| HAMILTON | 6.7\% |
| HANCOCK | 0.1\% |
| HARDEMAN | 0.6\% |
| HARDIN | 0.2\% |
| HAWKINS | 1.0\% |


| County | Percent |
| :--- | :---: |
| HAYWOOD | $0.3 \%$ |
| HENDERSON | $1.0 \%$ |
| HENRY | $0.4 \%$ |
| HICKMAN | $0.2 \%$ |
| HOUSTON | $0.3 \%$ |
| HUMPHREYS | $0.6 \%$ |
| JACKSON | $0.3 \%$ |
| JEFFERSON | $0.8 \%$ |
| JOHNSON | $0.1 \%$ |
| KNOX | $5.7 \%$ |
| LAKE | $0.4 \%$ |
| LAUDERDALE | $0.8 \%$ |
| LAWRENCE | $1.0 \%$ |
| LEWIS | $0.6 \%$ |
| LINCOLN | $0.7 \%$ |
| LOUDON | $0.9 \%$ |
| MACON | $0.5 \%$ |
| MADDISON | $2.5 \%$ |
| MARION | $0.5 \%$ |
| MARSHALL | $0.5 \%$ |
| MAURY | $1.3 \%$ |
| MCMINN | $1.0 \%$ |
| MCNAIRY | $0.9 \%$ |
| MEIGS | $0.4 \%$ |
| MONROE | $0.7 \%$ |
| MONTGOMERY | $1.8 \%$ |
| MOORE | $0.2 \%$ |
| MORGAN | $0.6 \%$ |
| OBION | $0.6 \%$ |
| OVERTON | $0.5 \%$ |
| PERRY | $0.2 \%$ |
| PICKETT | $0.0 \%$ |
| POLK | $0.3 \%$ |
| PUTNAM | $0.6 \%$ |
| RHEA | $0.9 \%$ |
| ROBERERTSON | $0.8 \%$ |
| RUTHERFORD | $1.7 \%$ |
| SCOTT | $0.8 \%$ |
| SEQUATCHIE | $1.0 \%$ |
| SEVIER | $0.2 \%$ |
| SHELBY | $0.3 \%$ |
| SMITH | $2.4 \%$ |
| STEWART | $7.7 \%$ |
| SUMNNAN | $0.3 \%$ |
|  | $2.4 \%$ |
|  |  |


| County | Percent |
| :--- | :---: |
| TIPTON | $1.5 \%$ |
| TROUSDALE | $0.2 \%$ |
| UNICOI | $0.3 \%$ |
| UNION | $0.2 \%$ |
| VAN BUREN | $0.1 \%$ |
| WARREN | $0.6 \%$ |
| WASHINGTON | $1.6 \%$ |
| WAYNE | $0.7 \%$ |
| WEAKLEY | $0.7 \%$ |
| WHITE | $0.2 \%$ |
| WILLIAMSON | $1.5 \%$ |
| WILSON | $2.6 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |

Table B-2:
Tuition Charges for a three hour class, Dual Enrollment Grant students vs. traditional students by institution ${ }^{\circ}$

| Community Colleges | Traditional Cost | Dual Enrollment Grant Cost |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Chattanooga State | $\$ 440$ | Same |
| Cleveland State | $\$ 452$ | Same |
| Columbia State | $\$ 440$ | Same |
| Jackson State | $\$ 440$ | $\$ 414^{*}$ |
| Motlow State | $\$ 440$ | Same |
| Nashville State | $\$ 417$ | Same |
| Northeast State | $\$ 451$ | Same |
| Pellissippi State | $\$ 471$ | $\$ 432^{*}$ |
| Southwest Tennessee | $\$ 471$ | Same |
| Walters State | $\$ 450$ | Same |
| Volunteer State | $\$ 437$ | Same |
| Average | $\$ 446$ | $\$ 444$ |
| Four-year public | Traditional Cost | Dual Enrollment Grant Cost |
| Austin Peay | $\$ 835$ | Same |
| East TN State | $\$ 846$ | 651 |
| Middle TN State | $\$ 846$ | Same |
| Tennessee Tech | $\$ 888$ | Same |
| Univ. of Memphis | $\$ 1,016$ | $\$ 385^{*}$ |
| UT Chattanooga | $\$ 935$ | Same |
| UT Martin | $\$ 843$ | 732 |
| UT Knoxville | $\$ 1,074$ | Same |
| Average | $\$ 910$ | $\$ 852$ |
| Four-year private | Traditional Cost | Dual Enrollment Grant Cost |
| Aquinas College | $\$ 1,845$ | $\$ 300^{*}$ |
| Bryan College | $\$ 2,520$ | $\$ 420$ |
| Carson-Newman | $\$ 2,598$ | $\$ 636$ |
| Christian Brothers | $\$ 2,685$ | $\$ 375^{*}$ |
| Freed-Hardeman | $\$ 1,359$ | $\$ 450$ |
| Johnson University | $\$ 1,020$ | Same |
| Lee University | $\$ 1,518$ | $\$ 321$ |
| Lemoyne-Owen | $\$ 1,263$ | $\$ 300$ |
| Lipscomb University | $\$ 2,715$ | $\$ 300^{*}$ |
| Martin Methodist | $\$ 2,490$ | $\$ 300$ |
| Maryville College | $\$ 3,654$ | $\$ 300^{*}$ |
| Milligan College | $\$ 1,200$ | $\$ 300$ |
| Southern Adventist | $\$ 2,220$ | $\$ 300^{*}$ |
| TN Temple | $\$ 1,125$ | $\$ 300$ |
|  |  |  |


| Four-year private | Traditional Cost | Dual Enrollment Grant Cost |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| TN Wesleyan | $\$ 1,560$ | $\$ 600$ |
| Trevecca University | $\$ 2,316$ | Same |
| Union University | $\$ 2,590$ | $\$ 375$ |
| Victory University | $\$ 1,062$ | Same |
| Average | $\$ 1,986$ | $\$ 646$ |

Source: TSAC
${ }^{\circ}$ Only institutions that responded to the survey are included
*Attending on HS campus

Table B-3
2010-2011 Dual Enrollment Grants by system and institution

| Institution | Number of Students | Dollars Awarded | $\%$ <br> Students within <br> each Sector |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TTC-Athens | 0 | - | $0 \%$ |
| TTC-Chattanooga | 0 | - | $0 \%$ |
| TTC-Covington | 24 | $\$ 13,500$ | $1 \%$ |
| TTC-Crossville | 46 | $\$ 18,000$ | $3 \%$ |
| TTC-Crump | 45 | $\$ 20,100$ | $3 \%$ |
| TTC-Dickson | 10 | $\$ 3,975$ | $1 \%$ |
| TTC-Elizabethton | 51 | $\$ 12,215$ | $3 \%$ |
| TTC-Harriman | 14 | $\$ 6,000$ | $1 \%$ |
| TTC-Hartsville | 199 | $\$ 91,900$ | $12 \%$ |
| TTC-Hohenwald | 83 | $\$ 31,725$ | $5 \%$ |
| TTC-Jacksboro | 11 | $\$ 5,700$ | $1 \%$ |
| TTC-Jackson | 6 | $\$ 2,100$ | $0 \%$ |
| TTC-Knoxville | 0 | - | $0 \%$ |
| TTC-Livingston | 140 | $\$ 57,000$ | $9 \%$ |
| TTC-McKenzie | 2 | $\$ 900$ | $0 \%$ |
| TTC-McMinnville | 0 | - | $0 \%$ |
| TTC-Memphis | 42 | $\$ 15,000$ | $3 \%$ |
| TTC-Morristown | 10 | $\$ 3,000$ | $1 \%$ |
| TTC-Murfreesboro | 3 | $\$ 900$ | $0 \%$ |
| TTC-Nashville | 193 | $\$ 46,650$ | $12 \%$ |
| TTC-Newbern | 99 | $\$ 41,900$ | $6 \%$ |
| TTC-Oneida | 234 | $\$ 111,300$ | $14 \%$ |
| TTC-Paris | 0 | - | $0 \%$ |
| TTC-Pulaski | 355 | $\$ 154,600$ | $22 \%$ |
| TTC-Ripley | 59 | $\$ 18,600$ | $4 \%$ |
| TTC-Shelbyville | 0 | - | $0 \%$ |
| TTC-Whiteville | 5 | $\$ 1,200$ | $0 \%$ |
| TTC Total | 1631 | $\$ 656,265$ | $100 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |


| Independent Four Year | Number of Students | Dollars Awarded | \% of Total <br> Students within <br> each Sector |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Aquinas College | 32 | $\$ 102,500$ | $0 \%$ |
| Aquinas College Primetime | 0 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Baptist Mem. Coll. Health \& | 101 | $\$ 360,125$ | $1 \%$ |
| Science |  |  |  |
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| Independent Four Year | Number of Students | Dollars Awarded | \% of Total Students within each Sector |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Belmont University | 666 | \$2,518,375 | 9\% |
| Bethel University | 305 | \$1,151,750 | 4\% |
| Bryan College | 156 | \$566,500 | 2\% |
| Bryan College Adult | 0 | - | 0\% |
| Carson Newman College | 509 | \$1,872,200 | 7\% |
| Christian Brothers University | 311 | \$1,175,500 | 4\% |
| Cumberland University | 263 | \$989,500 | 4\% |
| Fisk University | 27 | \$102,000 | 0\% |
| Free Will Baptist Bible College | 30 | \$114,000 | 0\% |
| Freed Hardeman University | 303 | \$1,144,000 | 4\% |
| Hiwassee College | 8 | \$28,000 | 0\% |
| Johnson University | 55 | \$200,000 | 1\% |
| King College | 217 | \$816,000 | 3\% |
| Knoxville College | 0 | - | 0\% |
| Lambuth University | 94 | \$342,000 | 1\% |
| Lane College | 21 | \$ 76,000 | 0\% |
| Lee University | 552 | \$2,078,375 | 7\% |
| LeMoyne-Owen College | 22 | \$81,601 | 0\% |
| Lincoln Memorial University | 300 | \$1,136,150 | 4\% |
| Lipscomb University | 684 | \$2,565,750 | 9\% |
| Martin Methodist University | 174 | \$647,000 | 2\% |
| Maryville College | 361 | \$1,345,800 | 5\% |
| Memphis College of Art | 35 | \$127,500 | 0\% |
| Milligan College | 207 | \$775,000 | 3\% |
| Rhodes College | 152 | \$567,125 | 2\% |
| South College | 0 | - | 0\% |
| Southern Adventist University | 218 | \$802,500 | 3\% |
| Tennessee Temple University | 1 | \$ 4,000 | 0\% |
| Tennessee Wesleyan University | 324 | \$1,229,368 | 4\% |
| Trevecca Nazarene University | 212 | \$781,500 | 3\% |
| Tusculum College | 207 | \$758,000 | 3\% |
| Union University | 538 | \$1,983,750 | 7\% |
| University of the South | 125 | \$466,000 | 2\% |
| Vanderbilt University | 196 | \$728,840 | 3\% |
| Victory College (formerly Crichton) | 0 | - | 0\% |
| Watkins Inst. Coll. Of Art \& Des. | 50 | \$175,625 | 1\% |
| TICUA Four Year Total | 7456 | \$27,812,334 | 100\% |
| Independent Two Year |  |  |  |
| TICUA- John A Gupton College | 4 | \$12,000 | 100\% |
| TICUA Two Year Total | 4 | \$12,000 | 100\% |


| University of Tennessee | Number of Students | Dollars Awarded | \% of Total <br> Students within <br> each Sector |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| University of TN, Chattanooga | 3142 | $\$ 11,652,121$ | $25 \%$ |
| University of TN, Health Science | 22 | $\$ 84,000$ | $0 \%$ |
| Center | 7785 | $\$ 29,050,390$ | $61 \%$ |
| University of TN, Knoxville | 1835 | $\$ 6,676,083$ | $14 \%$ |
| University of TN, Martin | 12784 | $\$ 47,462,594$ | $100 \%$ |
| University of TN Total |  |  |  |


| TN Board of Regents Four Year |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Austin Peay State University | 1668 | $\$ 6,064,603$ | $11 \%$ |
| East Tennessee State University | 1836 | $\$ 10,486,405$ | $12 \%$ |
| ETSU School of Pharmacy | 0 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Middle Tennessee State | 5647 | $\$ 20,702,909$ | $36 \%$ |
| University | 390 | $\$ 1,424,607$ | $3 \%$ |
| Tennessee State University | 3035 | $\$ 11,109,717$ | $19 \%$ |
| Tennessee Technological | 3012 | $\$ 11,050,210$ | $19 \%$ |
| University | 15588 | $\$ 60,838,451$ | $100 \%$ |
| University of Memphis |  |  |  |
| TN Board of Regents Four Year |  |  |  |


| TN Board of Regents Two Year |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| Chattanooga State CC | 502 | $\$ 833,625$ | $7 \%$ |
| Cleveland State CC | 300 | $\$ 525,555$ | $4 \%$ |
| Columbia State CC | 662 | $\$ 1,113,750$ | $9 \%$ |
| Dyersburg State CC | 178 | $\$ 301,250$ | $3 \%$ |
| Jackson State CC | 424 | $\$ 696,765$ | $6 \%$ |
| Motlow State CC | 492 | $\$ 824,104$ | $7 \%$ |
| Nashville State CC | 254 | $\$ 410,272$ | $4 \%$ |
| Northeast State CC | 544 | $\$ 962,500$ | $8 \%$ |
| Pellissippi State CC | 1042 | $\$ 1,735,250$ | $15 \%$ |
| Roane State CC | 779 | $\$ 1,353,736$ | $11 \%$ |
| Southwest Tennessee CC | 302 | $\$ 488,500$ | $4 \%$ |
| Volunteer State CC | 741 | $\$ 1,243,660$ | $11 \%$ |
| Walters State CC | 784 | $\$ 1,338,051$ | $11 \%$ |
| TN Board of Regents Two Year | 7004 | $\$ 11,827,018$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |

Source: TSAC September 29, 2011 Board of Directors Meeting Agenda;
www.tn.gov/tsac/About_Us/board_meetings_new/sept11/sept11meeting.shtml

Figure B-1: Distribution of weighted high school GPAs for Dual Enrollment Grant students, 2005-10


Figure B-2: Distribution of ACT composite scores for Dual Enrollment Grant students, 2005-10


## REFERENCES

ACT (2011). ACT profile report - state: Graduating class 2011 Tennessee. Retrieved from http://www.act.org/newsroom/data/2011/pdf/profile/Tennessee.pdf

College Board (2011a). Trends in college pricing. Washington DC: The College Board.

College Board (2011b). Trends in student aid. Washington DC: The College Board.

Tennessee High Education Commission [THEC] (2011a). Tennessee education lottery scholarship program annual report: Outcomes through fall 2010. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from http://tn.gov/thec/Legislative/Reports/2011/2011-07-28\ TELS\ Full\ Report.pdf

Tennessee High Education Commission [THEC] (2011b). The public agenda for Tennessee higher education 2010-2015. Nashville, TN. Retrieved from http://tn.gov/thec/complete college tn/ccta files/master plan/The\%20Public\%20Age nda\%20with\%20Appendices\%20Jan2011.PDF

Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation [TSAC] (2011, September 29). Board of directors meeting agenda. Retrieved from www.tn.gov/tsac/About_Us/board_meetings_new/sept11/sept11meeting.shtml

Watkins, S., \& Sherk, J. (2008). Who Serves in the US Military? Demographics of Enlisted Troops and Officers. Center for Data Analysis Report, 8, 05.
U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. (2008). The Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008. (VA Pamphlet 22-09-1). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Agenda Item: II.C.

DATE: January 26, 2012
SUBJECT: University of Tennessee Center for Business and Economic Research - The Transition from College to Career in Tennessee

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Information

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The Tennessee economy's ability to compete with the rest of the U.S. and the world depends crucially on the state's ability to develop and retain a highly skilled labor force. The state's two-year and fouryear institutions of higher education are key components of the state's strategy to create and sustain an amply-skilled labor force. In 2011, the University of Tennessee - Knoxville's Center for Business and Economic Research (CBER) initiated a series of studies for HCM Strategists, The Gates Foundation, and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) on the determinants of student success in college and beyond.

The attached report summarizes some of the results of these studies, focusing on student transitions from Tennessee public institutions of higher education to the Tennessee workforce.

CBER undertakes an analysis of all students who began as first-time freshmen at any one of the state's public institutions of higher education in 2002 for the 2002/2003 school year and in 2003 for school year 2003/04. A series of important outcomes for these students is explored, including their:

- persistence through college;
- degree completion;
- likelihood of working in the Tennessee economy; and
- earnings, if they are working in the Tennessee economy.

The report begins with a discussion of data used in this study as well as descriptive statistics for 2002 and 2003 first-time freshmen in Tennessee. This is followed by a summary of statistical analyses that explain which characteristics are most closely linked to workforce participation and earnings shortly after college. The last section offers conclusions, policy implications, and opportunities for additional research.
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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Tennessee economy's ability to compete with the rest of the U.S. and the world depends crucially on the state's ability to develop and retain a highly skilled labor force. The state's two-year and four-year institutions of higher education are key components of the state's strategy to create and sustain an amply-skilled labor force. In 2011 we initiated a series of studies for HCM Strategists, The Gates Foundation, and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) on the determinants of student success in college and beyond. ${ }^{2}$ This chapter summarizes some of the results of these studies, focusing on student transitions from Tennessee public institutions of higher education to the Tennessee workforce.

We undertake a careful analysis of all students who began as first-time freshmen at any one of the state's public institutions of higher education in 2002 for the 2002/2003 school year and in 2003 for school year 2003/04. ${ }^{3}$ We explore a series of important outcomes for these students, including their:

- persistence through college
- degree completion
- likelihood of working in the Tennessee economy and
- earnings if they are working in the Tennessee economy.

Each student's experience is tracked across campuses (if they chose to attend another school) and into the labor force. Thus, we follow students who begin at each campus to determine whether they obtained a degree at their initial campus or at any other public or private school in Tennessee or elsewhere in the nation. We analyze student education and work experience outcomes through the end of calendar year 2010 for both cohorts of students. Selected findings include the following:
(1) 72 percent of two-year college entrants and 45 percent of four-year college entrants failed to earn a degree by the spring of 2010 .
(2) Degree recipients had higher ACT scores than noncompleters, and higher ACT scores were associated with higher earnings after college.

[^25](3) Degree recipients came from neighborhoods that were more affluent and less diverse than those of noncompleters.
(4) The vast majority of bachelor's degree recipients finished college within $150 \%$ of normal time (six years). Associate's degree recipients were less expeditious.
(5) Four-year college noncompleters were close to minimum degree requirements, in terms of credits and semesters, but tended to stay in college just 2/3 as long as bachelor's degree recipients.
(6) Degree recipients earned nearly $\$ 10,000$ more than noncompleters seven years after entering college.
(7) The short-term returns to college persistence (i.e., the earnings premium for additional semesters enrolled) were positive for noncompleters but negative for degree recipients, indicating that persistence could be a good signal in the absence of a degree but excessive alongside a degree.

The report begins with a discussion of data used in this study as well as descriptive statistics for 2002 and 2003 first-time freshmen in Tennessee. This is followed by a summary of statistical analyses that explain which characteristics are most closely linked to workforce participation and earnings shortly after college. The last section offers conclusions, policy implications, and opportunities for additional research.

## I. CHARACTERISTICS OF COLLEGE COMPLETERS AND NON-COMPLETERS

Data on education experiences in Tennessee public institutions of higher education were obtained from THEC administrative files. Data on workforce experience and earnings through calendar year 2010 were obtained from the Tennessee Department of Labor and Workforce Development's unemployment insurance records. ${ }^{4}$ We must emphasize that results only reflect the initial effects of education and graduation on earnings and workforce participation because many graduates can only be observed for a few working years after graduation. Thus, the earnings and work data tend to represent the beginning of

[^26]work life and are not necessarily indicative of the career earnings profiles. ${ }^{5}$ Also, our analysis is limited to students who began higher education in Tennessee. We are not analyzing the outcomes of students who did not go to college or who attended institutions outside of Tennessee.

The 2002 cohort had a total of 24,630 first-time college freshmen, including 14,625 in four-year schools and 10,005 in two-year schools. The 2003 cohort had 24,485 students, with 14,041 from fouryear schools and 10,444 from two-year schools.

We divide students into four groups: those earning a bachelor's degree, those earning an associate's degree, those who stay in school for a brief period of time (defined as one semester for those entering two-year schools and two semesters for those entering four-year schools), and those staying in school longer but failing to earn a degree (henceforth, "extended non-completers"). The present discussion is focused on attributes of these four groups overall, but our related work examines student characteristics and completion outcomes across campuses as well. We find that 72 percent of Tennessee's two-year college entrants and 45 percent of four-year college entrants failed to complete a degree by the spring of 2010, seven to eight years after their initial enrollment and the last term for which we have data. Just less than 12 percent of all college-going students left after one term. Among all two-year college entrants in the 2002 and 2003 cohorts, 15 percent ultimately received an associate's degree, and 13 percent received a bachelor's degree. Among four-year college entrants, associate's degree receipt was very rare, and 53 percent received a bachelor's degree.

## Students Entering Two-Year Schools

Table 1 summarizes student characteristics by completion/non-completion category. We find that nearly 60 percent of students entering Tennessee's two-year colleges were female. A little less than four-fifths of students entering two-year schools from each cohort were white, more than one-sixth were African-American and the remainder was composed of small percentages of other ethnic groups. White students were somewhat better represented among degree recipients than they were among all two-year entrants, meaning that white students were slightly more likely to go on to earn a bachelor's degree or an associate's degree.

We measure age both in terms of student's actual age upon entering college and whether they were adults when entering college. In agreement with Tennessee's new funding formula for higher

[^27]education institutions, we define adult students to be those who were at least 25 years old at the time of enrollment. Overall, two-year college students were almost 21 years old, on average, when they began, and about one-seventh were considered adults when they started. Students who ultimately earned a bachelor's degree tended to enter college slightly younger than students who earned an associate's degree. First-time adult freshmen had a higher propensity to attend only one semester, and the average age of one-term students was also high. ${ }^{6}$

Administrative data systems were evolving around the time these students entered college, and accordingly, ACT data are closer to comprehensive for the 2003 entering cohort. ${ }^{7}$ For this group of students, the average two-year college entrant scored 18.5 on the ACT. Those who went on to earn a bachelor's degree had the highest average ACT (20.2), followed by those obtaining an associate's degree (19.4). Extended non-completers earned 17.9 points, on average, and single-term non-completers typically earned just 17.4 points.

We mapped each student's pre-college address to 2000 U.S. Census records, and Table 2 describes characteristics of the neighborhoods these students originated from. ${ }^{8}$ Non-completers tended to come from more racially and ethnically diverse neighborhoods with lower shares of married households and lower median incomes. Bachelor's degree recipients came from higher-income neighborhoods than associate's degree recipients, although the difference was small on average. About one-half of all two-year college entrants were from neighborhoods where the median household income was less than $\$ 36,000$, which is the threshold for low-income supplements to Tennessee's lotteryfunded HOPE scholarship. Statewide, the median household income was $\$ 36,800$ as of the 2000 U.S. Census, 36 percent of households were in rural areas, and 80 percent of the population was white, nonHispanic. Thus, Tennessee's two-year college entrants came from areas that closely resembled a typical Tennessee neighborhood but tended to be slightly more affluent and less diverse.

## Students Entering Four-Year Schools

Table 3 reports characteristics of students entering four-year schools. Both entering classes were slightly over one-half female, slightly less than three-fourths white, about one-fifth black, and a little over one percent Hispanic. Students entering four-year schools were much more likely to be male

[^28]or black than their two-year counterparts. Much like two-year college entrants, white students were somewhat more likely to receive a bachelor's degree.

The typical four-year college student was 19 years of age when he or she entered as a first-time freshman, with less than three percent of students considered to be adults when they first entered fouryear schools (compared with 13-14 percent for two-year schools). Adult students were betterrepresented among noncompleters than degree recipients, meaning that they were less likely to graduate than more traditional college freshmen. Students in both cohorts averaged 22 points on the ACT exam, with bachelor's degree recipients scoring 23 points on average and single-term noncompleters scoring around 20 points. The average student entered a campus that was less than 100 miles from their home. Those who attended college for one year or less tended to be closer to home than extended non-completers and degree recipients.

Table 4 summarizes features of the pre-college neighborhoods students came from as of the 2000 U.S. Census. Relative to the state as a whole, four-year college students came from neighborhoods that were 9 percentage points less likely to be rural and where the median income was about \$7,000 higher. Much like two-year college entrants, four-year entrants who ultimately completed a degree tended to come from neighborhoods with higher incomes and higher shares of white, married, and/or owner-occupied households.

## Graduation and Time to Degree

Table 5 summarizes the typical duration of college enrollment for degree completers who began college in 2002 or 2003. About 20-23 percent of students entering two-year colleges ultimately earned as associate's degree, and 13 percent ultimately earned a bachelor's degree. These figures include 793 students ( $7.9 \%$ ) from the 2002 cohort and 689 (6.6\%) from the 2003 cohort who received both an associate's and a bachelor's degree. Among four-year college entrants, 53 percent earned a bachelor's degree within the window of time we observe, and 3 percent earned an associate's degree.

Although community colleges are widely known as "two-year" institutions, and other colleges and universities are known as "four-year" institutions, many students do not obtain an associate's degree within two years or a bachelor's degree within four years. Two years for an associate's degree or four years for a bachelor's degree is called "100\% of normal time." Longer durations include 150\% of normal time (that is, three years for an associate's or six years for a bachelor's degree) and 200\% of normal time (four and eight years, respectively). Table 5 lists the percent of college enrollees who completed degrees within 100-200\% of normal time or more. Only 4 percent of two-year college
entrants received an associate's degree within $100 \%$ of normal time, and an even smaller share received a bachelor's degree within four years (which almost always entailed transferring to a four-year college or university). Degree completion rates for two-year entrants rose steadily thereafter, well past 200\% of normal time. Degree receipt was more common and more expeditious among four-year college entrants. One-fifth earned a bachelor's degree within four years, rising to nearly one half within six years.

## How Close Were Noncompleters to Graduation?

Given the high share of students who left college without a degree, the question of how close they came to graduation arises. Although we do not assess student progress through detailed degree requirements, we can readily observe how noncompleters compared to degree recipients in terms of credits earned and semesters enrolled. This section focuses on four-year college entrants, but qualitative persistence patterns are similar for two-year college entrants.

Figure 1 illustrates the number of cumulative college credits earned by single-term noncompleters, extended noncompleters, and bachelor's degree recipients. Obviously, students who left college after no more than one academic year were quite far from graduation, earning a small share of the credits earned by degree recipients. On average, we find that extended noncompleters earned 40 - 43 percent fewer credits than degree recipients, which indicates that noncompleters were relatively far behind graduates in terms of college persistence. But with $89-92$ cumulative credits, extended noncompleters were not far from the 120-credit benchmark that colleges typically require for bachelor's degree receipt.

Figure 2 illustrates the total number of fall and spring semesters students attended, by degree status. Extended noncompleters enrolled for seven semesters, on average, which is just one semester shy of $100 \%$ of the normal time to degree. By that measure, noncompleters exhibited lengthy college persistence. But bachelor's degree recipients tended to enroll for $10-11$ semesters (i.e., about $150 \%$ of normal time). So if graduates are a reliable indication of how long it usually takes to earn a degree, extended noncompleters typically persisted for about two-thirds as long as they needed to.

## II. FROM COLLEGE TO CAREER

## Employment of those Entering Two-Year Schools

The previous section demonstrated that if often takes several years to complete a degree, so accordingly, we examine employment outcomes seven or more years after beginning school. This allows sufficient time for almost all students who will receive a degree to do so and still permits a brief window to see work experience. We limit our focus to students who had left college - with or without a degree by January of 2009 for the 2002 entering cohort or January of 2010 for the 2003 cohort. Figure 3 reports the percentage of these groups employed in Tennessee seven years after starting college, by degree status. Two salient conclusions emerge. First, students who completed a degree were more likely to have Tennessee earnings seven years after entering college. And second, the effects of the 2008-2009 recession and its aftermath are evident in significantly lower labor force participation for the 2003 cohort. Compared to students who entered college just one year earlier, members of the 2003 cohort were much less likely to have Tennessee wages seven years after starting college.

Figure 4 plots average inflation-adjusted earnings seven years after starting college, by cohort and degree status. Again, we see lower wages for the later cohort and we also find that degree completers had much stronger employment outcomes, earning close to $\$ 10,000$ more than noncompleters. We expect the annual returns to education to increase for these students as time goes on and more data become available. Interestingly, associate's degree recipients earned slightly more than bachelor's degree recipients. This is partly due to the fact that associate's degree recipients tended to finish college earlier than bachelor's degree recipients, and therefore, they had more time in the labor market to find work and accumulate earnings. Our ongoing research in this area will assess longerterm earnings differentials across degree types.

## Employment of those Entering Four-Year Schools

Figure 5 plots the share of four-year college entrants who had Tennessee wages seven years after starting college, by degree status and cohort. Echoing our findings for two-yearn enrollees, degree recipients were much more likely to be working than noncompleters, and the later cohort had lower labor force participation rates regardless of degree completion. Figure 6 plots average inflation-adjusted earnings for 2002 and 2003 four-year college entrants, by degree status and cohort. Once again, we find that degree recipients earned about \$10,000 more than non-completers.

Figures 3-6 illustrate the economic returns to degree completion, but also the returns to persistence through college. Recall that "single-term noncompleters," are students who stayed no more than one semester in a community college or one academic year in a four-year college. Even though single-term noncompleters had more time out of college than any other group, and presumably more time to work, they tended to earn no more than other noncompleters, and they earned much less than degree recipients.

## Student Characteristics and Employment Outcomes: Regression Analysis

Summary statistics and figures allow us to see the characteristics of incoming students and examine how average student characteristics appear to be related to degree completion and labor outcomes. However, simple statistics only permit us to relate these outcomes to one student characteristic at a time when many factors influence degree completion, employment, and earnings, and these factors are often correlated and interdependent. Thus, we use multivariate regression analysis to decompose the effects of degree completion and different student characteristics on labor market participation and earnings in Tennessee.

First, we estimate the relationship between student characteristics and labor outcomes for all students. Student characteristics include pre-college variables summarized in Tables 1 and 3 (gender, demographics, age, ACT, and distance from home) as well as the type of college a student attended (two-year or four-year) and the length of time it took him or her to complete a degree (if one was completed at all). Additionally, we control for whether a student came from a low-income neighborhood ${ }^{9}$ and whether a student transferred from a community college to a four-year college or university in the state.

So that we may have ample time to observe employment outcomes, we limit the analysis to members of the 2002 cohort who left college (with a degree or as a non-completer) by January 1, 2009. Note that all student characteristics are based on their values at the time of college entry (fall 2002) and all time periods are measured from the starting year of the cohort. The analysis cannot account for students who left Tennessee to work elsewhere and only includes those who work for employers covered by the state unemployment insurance system. It is important to remember that the likelihood of being employed and the wages earned are functions of both sides of the labor market. Characteristics of students and their achievements may affect their choices of majors and whether and where (in or out

[^29]of Tennessee) they wish to work. These same characteristics may influence employers' willingness to hire people and the wages they will pay based on expectations of worker productivity.

This discussion focuses on two labor market outcomes: Tennessee employment seven years after entering college (2009) and average Tennessee wages in that year, adjusted for inflation. We also note the effect of education outcomes on full-time employment and earnings in 2009. ${ }^{10}$

We find that a number of pre-college student characteristics are linked to the propensity to work as well as earnings. Among individuals with Tennessee earnings, each additional point on the ACT was associated with $\$ 137$ in additional 2009 earnings. We observe interesting gender gaps in labor force participation and earnings. Males were 3.0 percentage points less likely to work, other things equal, yet working males earned nearly $\$ 3,000$ more than females, on average. White students were 5.5 percentage points more likely to work than other ethnic groups, and they tended to earn $\$ 2,183$ more. Holding everything else equal, higher age upon college entry in 2002 reduced the likelihood of 2009 employment but had no significant effect on wages. Students who lived in lower-income neighborhoods before college went on to earn $\$ 1,157$ less than their more advantaged peers. Those who went to school farther away from home were generally less likely to be working in 2009, suggesting weaker linkages to statewide labor market.

Education experience and college completion are strongly linked to work-force participation and earnings. Students who first entered two-year schools in 2002 were more likely to be employed seven years later, regardless of their achievements. This could reflect those students who were already employed upon entry to a two-year school in pursuit of training or an academic award. Students who started in a two-year school and transferred to a four-year school were less likely to be working in 2009, relative to the rest of their cohort in two-year schools. Regressions estimate wages and the likelihood of working in 2009 for several paths through college, and results illustrate how labor outcomes for each path compare to that of extended noncompleters who persist more than one semester in a community college or more than one academic year in a four-year school. Relative to these extended noncompleters, single-term noncompleters were 5.2 percentage points less likely to work and they earned \$1,572 less in 2009 wages. Many of these single-term students may have had no intention of pursuing a degree and were instead simply seeking the consumption value of college-level coursework. Or, it may be the case that the returns to college persistence are steep. Enrolling for a short spell in college may send a negative signal to employers.

[^30]We find evidence of meaningful returns to degree completion. People who earned an associate's degree were more likely to work fulltime than extended non-completers, but the evidence does not suggest that earning an associate's degree faster (i.e. less than 200 percent time) is more strongly linked to employment. This finding may reflect working individuals who are pursuing employment-related education and training but are not in a position to study full time. That is to say, students who pursue an associate's degree while working tend to take longer to complete a degree, but they are also more likely to have Tennessee wages after completing college. Students who completed a bachelor's degree within four years had the highest wage premium overall, typically earning \$13,034 more than extended noncompleters.

## The Returns to College Persistence: Regression Analysis

The above analysis shows that completers had higher earnings than those who failed to complete, regardless of whether they pursued a two-year or a four-year degree. This is consistent with a wealth of research supporting the "sheepskin effects" of degree receipt, in that college completers earn more than students who persisted in college - sometimes as long as degree recipients - but nonetheless failed to leave with a degree. If the returns to higher education are largely sheepskin effects, then students with no intention of finishing college (or insufficient skills to do so) may be better off in the workforce. It may be the case, however, that noncompleters can send a positive signal to future employers by persisting longer in college. In the absence of a degree, college persistence may reflect accumulated skills and intangible qualities like commitment that employers value. On the other hand, spending more time in college can be a poor signal to employers if additional semesters appear to be excessive or due to low grades. ${ }^{11}$ In this section we divide the 2002 cohort into subsamples according to where they started college (in a two-year or four-year school) and whether they completed a degree. Then for each subsample of students, we estimate the effect of an additional semester in college on calendar year 2009 earnings, controlling for observable student characteristics. It is important to keep in mind that since the regressions compare people from the same group in terms of graduation outcomes, the analyses are not comparing college students with people who did not enter higher education, nor are they comparing two-year graduates to four-year graduates. Also, people who lost their job prior to

[^31]2009 or chose not to take a job in Tennessee are omitted from the earnings analysis, at least in part because we do not know whether their absence from the Tennessee labor force was voluntary.

The emphasis here is on the effects of additional education (i.e., semesters enrolled) on the earnings of people within the different groups of completers and non-completers: selected findings are presented in Table 6. Results generally indicate that for noncompleters who started in two-year colleges, employers valued college persistence. For each additional semester in college, a two-year college noncompleter earned $\$ 668$ higher earnings in 2009, and noncompleters who transferred to a four-year school earned even more. Noncompleters who started in four-year schools did not gain a significant sum for each additional semester, although additional analysis in the full report to THEC indicates that college persistence significantly increased the likelihood of having any Tennessee wages in 2009-2010 and increased 2010 wages as well.

Interestingly, the returns to college persistence as measured by the number of semesters enrolled were significantly negative for students who left college with an associate's or bachelor's degree. This suggests that employers emphasize the credential of a degree more than the amount of school per se. Indeed, employers may see excess semesters as a signal that students are not efficient at getting work done. It is also possible that some of those taking additional coursework were doing so because they did not see good post-education labor market opportunities.

## III. CONCLUSIONS, POLICY IMPLICATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

To date, this series of studies is the most comprehensive of its kind regarding the determinants of program completion and subsequent employment and earnings by students in Tennessee public postsecondary education. In addition to presenting a wealth of descriptive information on progression, dropout, and graduation patterns, our research validates the State of Tennessee's recent emphasis on college completion and student retention. As evidenced by Figures 4 and 6, degree recipients earn nearly $\$ 10,000$ more than noncompleters seven years after completing college. Furthermore, our extended analyses of the returns to college persistence indicate that noncompleters can benefit from spending additional time in college. Unfortunately, achieving timely degree receipt appears to be a challenge for students, and extended stays in college can send a negative signal to employers. We find evidence suggesting that employers value degree receipt more than they value the amount of school per se.

This research also validates the public higher education funding formula committee's emphasis on two student subpopulations of compelling interest to Tennessee - adults and low-income students. Summary statistics suggest that graduation rates were relatively low for adults, and that they were more likely to have very short spells in college. Further, the analysis indicates that a sustained policy emphasis on low income students is warranted. Coming from a low-income neighborhood is associated with a lower likelihood of degree receipt, and subsequently, lower earnings after college.

The findings summarized here present several opportunities for additional research. First, our analyses accounted only for student characteristics in predicting college completion and post-college labor force participation and earnings. Our related research indicates that some institutions are more effective than others in advancing these outcomes. Additional work is necessary to identify specific institutional characteristics and practices that lead to variance in effectiveness across campuses. Second, we were limited to examining very near-term labor market outcomes of college graduates who chose to work for Tennessee employers covered by unemployment insurance (representing approximately 89 percent of Tennessee workers). Future work will trace the wage returns to higher education over a longer period of time, and for a more comprehensive set of workers. Finally, our ongoing and future research will examine the effect of particular policies (for example, Tennessee Education Lottery scholarships) on college completion and labor market outcomes.

TABLE 1: First-Time Freshmen Entering Two-Year Colleges in 2002 and 2003

|  | Non-Completers |  |  |  | Completers |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single-Term |  | Multi-Term |  | Associates |  | Bachelors |  |  |  |
|  | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 |
| Student Characteristic | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort |
| Male (\%) | 45.6 | 44.6 | 41.2 | 41.4 | 33.9 | 35.9 | 43.6 | 42.3 | 40.8 | 41.1 |
| White (\%) | 78.0 | 72.4 | 74.7 | 74.2 | 85.7 | 85.4 | 86.7 | 89.1 | 78.4 | 77.4 |
| Black (\%) | 18.4 | 23.8 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 10.2 | 10.1 | 9.1 | 5.5 | 17.8 | 18.3 |
| Other race/ethnicity (\%) | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 2.5 | 3.0 |
| Hispanic (\%) | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| Age as entering freshman | 21.8 | 22.2 | 20.8 | 20.8 | 20.9 | 21.0 | 19.3 | 19.2 | 20.7 | 20.8 |
| Older than 25 as entering freshman (\%) | 18.9 | 22.6 | 13.7 | 13.9 | 15.1 | 15.3 | 5.4 | 4.8 | 13.3 | 14.1 |
| Composite ACT | 20.4 | 17.4 | 17.8 | 17.9 | 19.1 | 19.4 | 20.0 | 20.2 | 18.6 | 18.5 |
| Distance in miles between home and college* | 24.9 | 27.9 | 30.9 | 32.8 | 29.6 | 29.7 | 36.5 | 31.7 | 30.8 | 31.5 |

* Where home addresses were missing, high school zip codes were used to calculate the distance between home and college.

TABLE 2: First-Time Freshmen Entering Two-Year Colleges in 2002 and 2003

| Characteristics of Students' Pre-College Neighborhoods, as of the | Non-Completers |  |  |  | Completers |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single-Term |  | Multi-Term |  | Associates |  | Bachelors |  |  |  |
|  | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 |
| 2000 U.S. Census | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort |
| White (\%) | 78.7 | 76.6 | 79.6 | 79.9 | 86.4 | 87.1 | 86.9 | 89.5 | 81.5 | 81.7 |
| Black (\%) | 18.0 | 20.2 | 17.2 | 16.8 | 10.6 | 10.0 | 9.9 | 7.6 | 15.2 | 15.2 |
| Hispanic (\%) | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 2.0 |
| Foreign born (\%) | 2.6 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Median age | 36.1 | 35.8 | 36.0 | 36.1 | 36.7 | 36.7 | 36.6 | 37.0 | 36.2 | 36.3 |
| Married households (\%) | 52.0 | 51.2 | 52.7 | 53.4 | 56.0 | 56.9 | 56.9 | 58.6 | 53.7 | 54.2 |
| Rural households (\%) | 36.4 | 33.9 | 33.9 | 35.3 | 41.7 | 42.8 | 40.5 | 43.9 | 36.3 | 37.2 |
| Owner-occupied housing unit with mortgage (\%) | 62.5 | 64.1 | 64.3 | 64.7 | 63.6 | 63.9 | 64.2 | 64.2 | 64.0 | 64.5 |
| Moved to this housing unit since 1995 (\%) | 45.3 | 46.1 | 46.1 | 46.0 | 45.0 | 44.8 | 45.2 | 44.8 | 45.7 | 45.7 |
| Housing unit built in 1990 or later (\%) | 22.6 | 22.6 | 24.1 | 24.4 | 25.3 | 26.2 | 26.5 | 28.4 | 24.4 | 24.9 |
| Employed (\% 16 and over) | 58.0 | 57.9 | 59.1 | 59.3 | 59.4 | 59.9 | 60.2 | 60.4 | 59.2 | 59.3 |
| Women in labor force (\% of total population) | 29.6 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.1 | 29.5 | 29.6 | 29.9 | 29.7 | 29.9 | 30.0 |
| Median income (1000s) | 35.6 | 35.9 | 37.6 | 38.1 | 38.0 | 38.6 | 39.6 | 40.4 | 37.7 | 38.2 |
| Income below poverty line (\%) | 15.2 | 15.5 | 14.1 | 13.8 | 12.8 | 12.5 | 12.2 | 11.6 | 13.8 | 13.6 |
| Low income (median income <=36,000 with home Census block grour | 43.5 | 69.8 | 46.5 | 52.5 | 46.9 | 48.9 | 46.1 | 44.7 | 46.2 | 53.3 |
| 2000-2010 compounded per capita income growth rate* | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| 2000-2010 compounded population growth rate* | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| * Compound growth rates were calculated using the 2000 Census and 2010 Census estimates as of July 2011. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 3: First-Time Freshmen Entering Four-Year Colleges in 2002 and 2003

|  | Non-Completers |  |  |  | Completers |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single-Term |  | Multi-Term |  | Associates |  | Bachelors |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 |  | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 |
| Student Characteristic | 2002 Cohort 2003 Cohort |  | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | 2002 Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort |
| Male (\%) | 49.5 | 47.9 | 49.1 | 47.8 | 37.9 | 41.2 | 41.7 | 43.1 | 45.0 | 45.2 |
| White (\%) | 70.6 | 68.9 | 69.2 | 68.4 | 89.0 | 86.2 | 78.3 | 77.7 | 74.7 | 73.7 |
| Black (\%) | 22.7 | 24.8 | 24.9 | 26.0 | 8.1 | 11.1 | 16.7 | 17.1 | 20.0 | 20.9 |
| Other race/ethnicity (\%) | 4.7 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.1 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| Hispanic (\%) | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Age as entering freshman | 19.4 | 19.6 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.5 | 18.5 | 18.8 | 18.8 |
| Older than 25 as entering freshman (\%) | 5.8 | 6.2 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Composite ACT | 20.2 | 20.5 | 21.2 | 21.1 | 21.6 | 21.4 | 22.9 | 23.0 | 22.4 | 22.1 |
| Distance in miles between home and college* | 55.5 | 58.1 | 76.1 | 76.6 | 77.3 | 63.6 | 96.3 | 94.8 | 84.7 | 83.5 |

* Where home addresses were missing, high school zip codes were used to calculate the distance between home and college.

TABLE 4: First-Time Freshmen Entering Four-Year Colleges in 2002 and 2003

| Characteristics of Students' Pre-College Neighborhoods, as of the 2000 | Non-Completers |  |  |  | Completers |  |  |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single-Term |  | Multi-Term |  | Associates |  | Bachelors |  |  |  |
|  | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 | 2002 | 2003 |
| U.S. Census | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort | Cohort |
| White (\%) | 79.1 | 77.1 | 78.4 | 78.0 | 85.1 | 85.3 | 82.8 | 82.6 | 81.0 | 80.5 |
| Black (\%) | 17.1 | 18.9 | 17.3 | 18.0 | 11.3 | 11.6 | 13.1 | 13.4 | 14.9 | 15.6 |
| Hispanic (\%) | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.3 |
| Foreign born (\%) | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| Median age | 35.7 | 35.4 | 35.3 | 35.4 | 36.4 | 36.6 | 35.8 | 36.0 | 35.6 | 35.7 |
| Married households (\%) | 53.3 | 51.8 | 53.3 | 53.1 | 57.2 | 57.5 | 55.8 | 56.4 | 54.7 | 54.7 |
| Rural households (\%) | 34.6 | 32.0 | 26.4 | 25.2 | 35.0 | 36.1 | 25.7 | 26.8 | 27.1 | 27.1 |
| Owner-occupied housing unit with mortgage (\%) | 66.1 | 65.9 | 68.7 | 68.7 | 66.2 | 67.5 | 69.8 | 69.5 | 69.0 | 68.7 |
| Moved to this housing unit since 1995 (\%) | 47.3 | 47.7 | 49.7 | 49.6 | 47.3 | 46.4 | 50.0 | 49.2 | 49.6 | 49.1 |
| Housing unit built in 1990 or later (\%) | 25.4 | 24.0 | 26.8 | 26.4 | 27.8 | 28.9 | 29.4 | 28.7 | 28.1 | 27.4 |
| Employed (\% 16 and over) | 59.4 | 58.9 | 61.2 | 61.2 | 60.3 | 61.1 | 62.7 | 62.3 | 61.8 | 61.4 |
| Women in labor force (\% of total population) | 30.3 | 30.3 | 31.1 | 31.2 | 29.8 | 30.5 | 31.3 | 31.0 | 31.1 | 31.0 |
| Median income (1000s) | 38.6 | 37.9 | 42.2 | 42.5 | 41.7 | 42.4 | 45.5 | 46.4 | 43.6 | 44.0 |
| Income below poverty line (\%) | 13.6 | 14.2 | 12.2 | 12.1 | 11.4 | 10.8 | 10.7 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 |
| Low income (median income <=36,000 with home Census block group) | 21.9 | 72.4 | 35.2 | 41.1 | 39.4 | 38.1 | 32.9 | 34.0 | 32.7 | 41.3 |
| 2000-2010 compounded per capita income growth rate* | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| 2000-2010 compounded population growth rate* | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |

* Compound growth rates were calculated using the 2000 Census and 2010 Census estimates as of July 2011.

TABLE 5: Time to Degree Completion for First-Time Freshmen

|  | Two-Year |  | Four-Year |  | All Entering |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 2002 \\ \text { Cohort } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2003 \\ \text { Cohort } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2002 \\ \text { Cohort } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2003 \\ \text { Cohort } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2002 \\ \text { Cohort } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2003 \\ \text { Cohort } \end{array}$ |
| Associate's obtained in ... |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100\% time (\%) | 4.3 | 4.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| 150\% time (\%) | 11.5 | 11.2 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 5.1 | 5.0 |
| 200\% time (\%) | 16.2 | 15.4 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 7.3 | 7.2 |
| by Spring 2010 (\%) | 22.5 | 20.1 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 11.1 | 10.1 |
| Bachelor's obtained in ... |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100\% time (\%) | 2.1 | 2.2 | 19.2 | 20.1 | 12.2 | 12.4 |
| 150\% time (\%) | 10.2 | 10.7 | 47.8 | 49.2 | 32.5 | 32.7 |
| 175\% time (\%) | 12.3 | 12.3 | 51.5 | 52.2 | 35.6 | 35.1 |
| 200\% time (\%) | 13.4 | - | 53.3 | - | 37.1 | - |

For bachelor's degrees, Spring 2010 is $200 \%$ time for the 2002 cohort and $175 \%$ time for the 2003 cohort.
For associate's degree, Spring 2010 is $400 \%$ time for the 2002 cohort and $350 \%$ time for the 2003 cohort.
Students who obtained both degrees are included in the statistics for both associate's and bachelor's degrees.
Percentages are cumulatives within degree.

Figure 1. Extended Noncompleters Earned 40-43
Percent Fewer Credits Than Bachelor's Degree Recipients


Figure 2. Extended Noncompleters Enrolled for 32-33 Percent Fewer Semesters Than Bachelor's Degree Recipients


Figure 3. Degree Completers are More Likely to be Working in Tennessee Seven Years After Entering a Community College


Figure 4. Degree Completers Earn Higher Wages Seven Years After Entering a Community College


Figure 5. Degree Completers are More Likely to be Working in Tennessee Seven Years After Entering a Four-Year College or University


Figure 6. Degree Completers Earn Higher Wages Seven Years After Entering a Four-Year College or University


Table 6: Regression Results for the Effect of Each Additional Semester in College on Employment and Earnings, by Type of College and Completion/Noncompletion

|  | Estimated Change in Inflation-Adjusted <br> Tennessee Wages in 2009 (if Non-Zero) <br> for Each Additional Semester in College, <br> 2002-2008 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Subsample of 2002 College Entrants |  |
| Noncompleters who started in two-year colleges | $668^{*}$ |

[^32]

Agenda Item:

DATE: January 26, 2012
SUBJECT: Improving Teacher Quality Grant Program Awards, 2012
ACTION RECOMMENDED: Information

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Operating as Title II of the No Child Left Behind Act, the Improving Teacher Quality Grant Program is a federally funded program which provides grants to public and private higher education institutions and non-profit organizations. Administered in Tennessee by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, these grants are designed to conduct training for in-service K-12 teachers.

In accordance with the state's adoption of the Common Core Standards in English/Language Arts and Mathematics, THEC and the Tennessee Department of Education jointly developed the Request for Proposals which focused on providing high quality professional development in these subjects to in-service teachers. An advisory committee consisting of both K-12 and higher education experts was convened to review grant proposals and make funding recommendations to the Commission. This year's Advisory Committee is listed on Attachment A.

Attachment B presents the projects and funding levels recommended by the Advisory Committee. The General Competition projects will be funded for the period January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012. Thirty proposals were submitted; of those, the Advisory Committee recommended funding for 10 projects totaling $\$ 716,115$.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION INCLUDED: A list of recommended institutions and funding levels is provided in Attachment B. The grant review process is described on Attachment C to this agenda item.

OTHER SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE: All grant proposals are available for review at the Commission office.

## ATTACHMENT A

2012 IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Kathy Butler<br>Sumner County Schools<br>Connie Casha<br>Tennessee Department of Education<br>Kay Clark<br>Tennessee Board of Regents<br>Nicki Fields<br>Tennessee Education Association<br>Art Fuller<br>Tennessee State Board of Education<br>Jessica Gibson<br>Tennessee Higher Education Commission<br>Marianne Gilbert<br>Williamson County Schools<br>Wesley Hall<br>Tennessee Higher Education Commission<br>Fred Heifner<br>Cumberland University<br>India Lane<br>University of Tennessee

## ATTACHMENT B <br> IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY 2012 RECOMMENDED PROJECTS

## PUBLIC TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

## Volunteer State Community College

\$71,364
"Learning Math Through Science: The Upper Cumberland Common Core Initiative"
Dr. James Roberson

## PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

## East Tennessee State University

\$75,000
"Integrating K-2 Inquiry and Hands-on Science with Math Common Core Standards" Dr. Chih-Che Tai

Middle Tennessee State University
\$59,031
"Project RISE (Relevant Instruction in Social Studies/History and English/Language Arts)" Dr. Phillip Waldrop

## Tennessee Technological University

\$74,829
"Discovering High School Mathematics: Teaching Content for Meaning" Dr. Holly Anthony

Tennessee Technological University
\$74,318
"Institute for Reading, Writing, and Critical Thinking: When Arts and Sciences Collide" Dr. Shannon Collins

## University of Memphis

\$74,286
"Community of Practice: Unpacking and Implementing the E/LA Common Core State Standards"
Dr. Mary Boudreaux

## University of Memphis

\$67,441
"Securing the Foundation of the Algebra Pyramid"
Dr. Alistair Windsor
University of Tennessee-Chattanooga
\$71,555
"Exploring Middle School Mathematics"
Dr. Meg Kiessling

## University of Tennessee-Knoxville

\$75,000
"Write On! Strategic and Interactive Writing Instruction"
Dr. Kimberly Wolbers
PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
Lee University
\$73,291
"Mathematics in Biotechnology (MIB): Integrating Math Core Standards in High School Biology"
Dr. Lori West

## ATTACHMENT C IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

On August 1, 2011, a memo from Dr. Rhoda and the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Improving Teacher Quality Grants was distributed to college and university chancellors, presidents, deans, and faculty. A contact at each of the 41 teacher preparation institutions was sent the RFP.

The RFP included the background of ITQ grants, federal requirements, funding priorities as determined by THEC, a description of eligible partners (including a list of high-need school districts), competition guidelines, the grant timeline, the evaluation rubric, and all appropriate forms to be completed for proposals. A Notice of Intent to Submit was due via email by September 12, 2011 and completed grant proposals were due to THEC on October 17, 2011 by $4: 30$ p.m. central.

THEC staff distributed the grant proposals to advisory committee members for review prior to the advisory committee meeting on November 14, 2011. The committee was divided into teams for Mathematics and English/Language Arts. The teams met separately in subject groups to discuss the grants related to their content area and score the grants according to the evaluation rubric.

Proposals with the top scores from both Mathematics and English/Language Arts were compiled into a master list. The committee could pose questions about the grant proposal, make recommendations or amendments, and discuss the level of funding the proposal should receive. The committee then funded the proposals in scored-order with necessary geographical requirements taken into account.

DATE: January 26, 2012
SUBJECT: Audit Committee Report
ACTION RECOMMENDED: Information

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The creation of an audit committee was required under Public Chapter 310, known as the "State of Tennessee Audit Committee Act of 2005." The audit committee has authority to conduct or authorize investigations into any matter within its scope of responsibility. The Commission approved the merging of the THEC and TSAC audit committees on July 24, 2008.

## Audit Committee Meeting December 2, 2011

The meeting was held with all five members present: Claude Pressnell, Chair; Robert White, Sharon Hayes, Sammy Stuard, and Greg Turner. THEC and TSAC staff members also participated. This meeting served as an orientation and working session to discuss items in detail.

The background and responsibilities of the audit committee and the role of the internal auditor were discussed. Staff provided overviews of the THEC and TSAC divisions. Staff reviewed with the committee the draft of the TSAC FY11 financial statements and the work programs for both agencies.

The accounting issue related to averted claims in the loan FFELP program was discussed. The analysis is now complete and the final request to transfer funds from the Federal Fund to the Operating Fund was sent to the USDOE. Below is a summary of the averted claims by year.

FY05 $\$ 2,038,264.81$ request being reviewed by USDOE
FY06 2,629,871.94 request being reviewed by USDOE
FYO7 2,015,988.81 request being reviewed by USDOE
FY08 2,519,166.25 Approved
FY09 3,782,145.43 Approved
FY10 1,751,007.93 Approved
Action items included the approval of the minutes from the November 18, 2010 Audit Committee meeting. These are attached as an information item.

The state's Financial Integrity Act requires an annual risk assessment to be submitted by December $31^{\text {st }}$ of each year to the Department of Finance and Administration and the Comptroller of the Treasury. The assessment due December 31, 2011 was prepared by management and submitted to the audit committee prior to the meeting for review. At the audit committee meeting, the specifics of the assessment were discussed. The committee voted to approve the assessment.

# Tennessee Higher Education Commission/Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation Audit Committee Meeting Minutes 

November 18, 2010
The THEC/TSAC Audit Committee meeting was convened at the end of the THEC work session with members Katie Winchester, Chair, Robert White, and Cathy Pierce in attendance. The agenda, minutes from the April 29, 2010 meeting, and the THEC/TSAC Audit Committee Report were provided to all members of the committee in advance of the meeting and were included in the THEC member notebooks.

Dr. Rhoda welcomed Cathy Pierce as the newest member of the committee. She is the Commissioner of Finance and Administration designee to the TSAC board.

Katie Winchester called the meeting to order.
Approval of Minutes, April 29, 2010
Ms. Winchester called for a motion to approve the minutes which had been sent to the audit committee via email. Robert White made a motion to approve the minutes. Cathy Pierce seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted.

## Audit Committee Charter - Status of charter revisions

Ms. Winchester called on Ann Collett, Director of Internal Audit, to present. The Commission had approved revisions at the July 29, 2010 meeting. At the TSAC Board meeting in September, an amendment suggested by Claude Pressnell was approved by the Board to add the words "with representation from both organizations" so that the sentence would read "The Audit Committee shall consist of five members with representation from both organizations who are generally knowledgeable in financial, management, and auditing matters." The charter revision was submitted to the Comptroller's office and has been approved.

## Annual risk assessment

Ms. Winchester noted that the assessment had been submitted to the audit committee members for their review. Ms. Collett discussed the process of completing the assessment. Part of the process of the assessment is for the agencies to do their own analysis, adding items specific to the agencies. Jason Cavender asked staff to review their prior year assessments and modify as needed. The information was reviewed and compiled. Ms. Collett stated she had been in touch with each committee member about the assessment. Dr. Pressnell and Mr. Murrah, members who were not present had indicated they did not have any additional comments or questions.

Ms. Winchester noted the importance of the risk assessment and that staff and Ms. Collett had satisfied the audit committee's questions during this process. Ms. Winchester called for a motion to approve. Ms. Pierce made a motion to approve the assessment. Robert White seconded the motion; the motion was duly adopted.

## TSAC Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFELP)-Status of averted claims review

Ms. Collett noted that this is an issue discussed with the committee previously. This involves an accounting issue going back to a practice in FY05. Ms. Collett explained the Federal and Operating funds, the process of default claims paid to lenders, and why funds would be returned to TSAC. FY 09 was completed first. TSAC has received approval from the USDOE to transfer $\$ 3,782,145.43$ to the Operating Fund.

Requests have been submitted to USDOE to transfer $\$ 4,270,174.18$ for FY08 and FY10. Ms. Collett had submitted a report on each of those years to the audit committee, explaining the process used to reach concurrence with the fiscal staff on the amounts. The amount of supporting documentation was discussed with the anticipation that the review by USDOE will not take as long for these and the remaining years.

Ms. Collett added that after all the years have been completed she will do a final report that will include management's comments.

## Division of State Audit - Status of TSAC Financial and Compliance Audit

 Auditors are conducting their final review of the report for FY09. The committee will be notified if an exit conference is scheduled. The state's Single Audit Report for FY09 was released in August and included the two findings previously discussed. These will be in the FYO9 TSAC report. Auditors are currently working on the FY10 audit.
## Other

Dr. Rhoda discussed the makeup of the audit committee and how the numbers will shift back and forth between three and two representatives from THEC and TSAC. He stated that Jack Murrah has resigned from the Commission effective December 1 and that Sammy Stuard, a new TSAC board member has agreed to serve on the audit committee.

Ms. Collett reported she had followed up with the Comptroller's office on the frequency of audit committee meetings and they confirmed that the wording in the charter of at least one meeting a year was adequate. Ms. Collett also provided a handout on conducting meetings via conference call.

## Adjournment

Ms. Winchester asked if there were any other issues that need to come before the audit committee. Being none, the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes prepared by Ann Collett
Minutes approved by:

Claude Pressnell, THEC/TSAC Audit Committee Chair

Agenda Item: II.G.

DATE: January 26, 2012
SUBJECT: Legislative Report
ACTION RECOMMENDED: Information

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The General Assembly has reconvened for what many expect to be one of the shortest sessions in recent years. As previously reported, there have been a couple of bills filed that directly impact the Commission. Staff will provide the Commission with an overview of all bills filed to date that will have an impact on the Commission to include those related to the lottery scholarship.



[^0]:    * Program met either enrollment or graduation benchmark

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Represents duplicate counts, because a student may attend more than one institution in an academic year
    ${ }^{3}$ Several studies can be found on the THEC Policy, Planning, and Research website:
    http://thec.ppr.tn.gov/THECSIS/Lottery/Lottery.aspx
    ${ }^{4}$ The annual fact book can be found at: http://www.tn.gov/thec/Legislative/Reports.html

[^2]:    Source: Tennessee Student Assistance Corporation (TSAC) year-end report

    * Not all programs began in the same year, which effects each programs percent of total students served and total dollars awarded

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ Not all programs began in the same year

[^4]:    ${ }^{11}$ These requirements can be different for Dual Enrollment Grant students and traditional students.
    2012 Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship Special Report | 16

[^5]:    ${ }^{12}$ Currently, THEC does not collect first name, last name, and date of birth from the systems. However, we will be receiving this information from the systems beginning in the 2012 academic year. Doing so will allow us to check postsecondary enrollment across state borders through the National Student Clearinghouse:
    http://www.studentclearinghouse.org/
    ${ }^{13}$ The Dual Enrollment Grant program is open to juniors and seniors in high school, and the cohort year is determined by the first year that a student participates in the program. Meaning, juniors in high school are counted in the cohort year counts.
    ${ }^{14}$ Presently, THEC's student information system (SIS) only has enrollment information for the 2010-2011 academic year.

[^6]:    ${ }^{15}$ One of the data challenges the researchers faced was defining when a Dual Enrollment Grant student was a first-time freshman. As a result, throughout the report, Dual Enrollment Grant students postsecondary cohorts are defined by the fall semester following the year students graduated from high school.

[^7]:    ${ }^{16}$ Credit hour accumulation is one of the measures utilized by THEC's new outcomes based funding formula. Each of the credit hour bench marks is essentially a proxy for one year of full-time enrollment (the completion of 12 credit hours a semester).

[^8]:    ${ }^{17}$ If the growth in the percentage of students qualifying for TELS scholarships had occurred based on high school GPA, and the non-Dual Enrollment Grant TELS population experienced similar growth, an argument could be made that these increases may be a symptom of grade inflation. However, preliminary analyses showed that there has been little variation in the percentage of students qualifying for a TELS scholarship regardless of eligibility criteria met in the last two years.

[^9]:    ${ }^{18}$ Gift aid is defined as scholarship and grants from any source that do not require repayment.
    ${ }^{19}$ Full eligibility requirements can be found on TSAC's College Pays website: www.tn.gov/collegepays
    2012 Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship Special Report | 26

[^10]:    ${ }^{20}$ The eligibility requirements can be found on TSAC's College Pays website: www.tn.gov/collegepays
    ${ }^{21}$ This is an unduplicated count of students within and across years.

[^11]:    ${ }^{22}$ Full-time is defined as 12 credit hours
    ${ }^{23} 150 \%$ of time is three years for an associate's degree and six years for a bachelor's degree assuming 15 hours per semester.

[^12]:    ${ }^{24}$ Source: THEC SIS
    ${ }^{25}$ Source: THEiC SIS; Complete College TN: http://thec.ppr.tn.gov/THECSIS/CompleteCollegeTN/Default.aspx

[^13]:    ${ }^{26}$ See the Eligibility Requirements section for the definition of a qualifying "veteran"
    ${ }^{27}$ Students must receive a non-failing grade as their final course grade in order to receive the award
    ${ }^{28}$ Full eligibility requirements can be found on TSAC's College Pays website: www.tn.gov/collegepays
    2012 Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship Special Report

[^14]:    ${ }^{29}$ This is an unduplicated count of students within and across years.

[^15]:    ${ }^{30}$ Source: THEC SIS

[^16]:    ${ }^{31}$ As designated by the fifth annual guide of Military Advanced Education's Guide to Military-Friendly Colleges and Universities. The report can be found here:
    www.kmimediagroup.com/files/4th\%20Annual\%20Guide\%20to\%20Top\%20Military-
    Friendly\%20Colleges\%20\&\%20Universities\%202010-2011.pdf
    2012 Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship Special Report | 40

[^17]:    ${ }^{32}$ Full eligibility requirements can be found on TSAC's College Pays website: www.tn.gov/collegepays

[^18]:    ${ }^{33}$ This is an unduplicated count of students within and across years.
    ${ }^{34}$ Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Database (IPEDS) 2010 Institutional Characteristics Survey. The instate average tuition and mandatory fees for graduate students at Tennessee public universities in 2010 was \$7,498.

[^19]:    ${ }^{35}$ Three years is considered 150 percent of normal time for most master's degree programs.
    2012 Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship Special Report |
    45

[^20]:    ${ }^{36}$ For the purpose of this program, health resource shortage area means an area determined as a health resource shortage area by the Department of Health, Office of Rural Health.
    ${ }^{37}$ Full eligibility requirements can be found on TSAC's College Pays website: www.tn.gov/collegepays
    ${ }^{38}$ Exceptions include military service

[^21]:    ${ }^{39}$ This is an unduplicated count of students within and across years.
    ${ }^{40}$ See the data limitations section for the percent missing

[^22]:    ${ }^{41}$ This could not be determined due to the large number of missing cases

[^23]:    ${ }^{42} e^{*}$ GRandS is the TSAC loan and scholarship data system that is managed by NelNet Guarantor Solutions.
    ${ }^{43}$ Enrollment verification is limited to institutions participating in the Clearinghouse 2012 Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship Special Report | 50

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ We thank the Tennessee Higher Education Commission for providing data used in this study and for providing helpful feedback throughout its progress. We are also indebted to Grant Thrall, HCM Strategists, the Gates Foundation, and other members of the Context for Success consortium for comments and suggestions on related work.

[^25]:    ${ }^{2}$ See Carruthers, Celeste K., William F. Fox, Matthew N. Murray, and Angela R. Thacker. "Educational Outcomes for Students Attending Tennessee Higher Education Institutions," (forthcoming) prepared for the Tennessee Higher Education Commission and Carruthers, Celeste K., William F. Fox, Matthew N. Murray, Grant Thrall, and David Wright, "College Participation, Persistence, Graduation, and Labor Market Outcomes: An Input-Adjusted Framework for Assessing the Effectiveness of Tennessee's Higher Education Institutions," (forthcoming), prepared for the Context for Success Project, an initiative of HCM Strategists and the Gates Foundation.
    ${ }^{3}$ Students are regarded as beginning in 2002 if they are first-time enrollees in the summer or fall of 2002. Students in 2003 are defined in a similar manner. Students who are dual enrolled while in high school are considered first-time enrollees when they begin higher education after graduation from high school.

[^26]:    ${ }^{4}$ We are only able to examine workers who are in the Tennessee unemployment insurance system, which primarily applies to people who work for an employer and excludes people who work for themselves. Farm workers are also generally excluded. Approximately 89 percent of the state's workers are covered by the unemployment system, so we underestimate the share of graduates working in the state since we are unable to see these uncovered workers.

[^27]:    ${ }^{5}$ Age-earnings profiles vary systematically for different degrees, levels of educational attainment and across an individual's lifespan.

[^28]:    ${ }^{6}$ This finding may be partly the result of older students being more likely to take a specific certificate program or other type of training with no intention of earning a degree.
    ${ }^{7}$ Additionally, many students entering two-year colleges did not take the ACT.
    ${ }^{8}$ We thank Grant Thrall, retired Professor of Geography at the University of Florida, for matching student addresses with 2000 U.S. Census data.

[^29]:    ${ }^{9}$ In agreement with Tables 2 and 4, low-income neighborhoods are defined as areas where the median income was less than $\$ 36,000$ as of the 2000 U.S. Census.

[^30]:    ${ }^{10}$ Full-time employment is defined as receiving at least full-time minimum wage for the fourth quarter of calendar year 2009. Full-time quarterly wages are annualized.

[^31]:    ${ }^{11}$ See Flores-Lagunes, A., and A. Light. "Interpreting Degree Effects in Returns to Education." Journal of Human Resources 45 (2010): 439-467.

[^32]:    * Statistically significant

