

Appendix A

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges

Summary of Substantive Change Issues Impacting State College Funding:

Institutions seeking to offer coursework at a more advanced level than that for which they are currently approved must notify the Commission of their intent at least 12 months in advance, and submit an application for level change at least 9 months before the expected start date of the proposed programs. Such a level change will require a visit by a substantive change committee to determine continued compliance with the Commission's *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*. An institution may not initiate any additional degree programs at the more advanced degree level that would be considered substantive change until after the Commission has taken positive action on its continued accreditation following a Substantive Change Committee visit.

Substantive Change Criteria

Faculty Support: The college will provide a complete faculty roster including a description of those faculty member's academic qualifications and other experiences relevant to the courses taught, and course load in the new program as well as course work taught in other programs currently offered; evidence that the faculty members are adequate to support the program; and the impact of the new initiative on faculty workload. (Substantive Change Prospectus Section 5)

The college should provide a description of faculty loads and duties (such as advising, committee service, curriculum/program review) establishing the adequacy of the number of full-time faculty. (Core Requirement 8)

The college should provide a list of all faculty members who have been assigned supervisory responsibility for a major within each new degree program, the major for which the faculty member is responsible, the professional and scholarly credentials of the faculty member, and a list of the courses to be taught by the faculty member. (Core Requirement 8)

Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements:

1) The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of its academic programs. (Substantive Change Committee Report 2.8)

2) At least 25 percent of the discipline course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty members holding the terminal degree – usually the earned doctorate – in the discipline, or the equivalent of the terminal degree. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.5.4)

3) The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline in accordance with the guidelines listed below. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensures and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.7.1)

Library and Learning Resources: The college will describe library and information resources – general as well as specific to the program – and staffing and services that are in place to support the initiative. If reliant upon other libraries, describe those collections and their relevance to the proposed program(s) and include a copy of the formal agreements in the appendix. Relative to electronic resources, describe how students and faculty will access information, training for faculty and students in the use of online resources, and staffing and services available to students and faculty. (Substantive Change Prospectus Section 6)

The college should provide a description of library/learning resources that have been acquired to support the new degree programs or copies of contracts with institutions that provide library services or access to learning resources (written, formal agreements with other libraries for resource materials and services). The college should be able to describe the relevancy of their collections to the proposed programs. (Core Requirement 9)

The college should provide a plan for supporting the expansion of library resources/the contracts needed for the new programs and the focus of that support. (Core Requirement 9)

Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements:

1) The institution, through ownership or formal arrangements or agreements, provides and supports student and faculty access and user privileges to adequate library collections and services and to other learning/information resources consistent with the degree offered. Collections, resources, and services are sufficient to support all its educational, research, and public service programs. (Substantive Change Committee Report 2.9)

2) The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff – with appropriate education or experiences in library and/or other learning/information resources – to accomplish the mission of the institution. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.8.3)

Financial Support: The college will provide a business plan that includes the following: (a) a description of financial resources to support the change, including a budget for the first year; (b) projected revenues and expenditures, and cash flow; (c) the amount of resources going to institutions or organizations for contractual or support services; and (d) the operational, management, and physical resources available for the change. Provide contingency plans if required resources do not materialize. (Substantive Change Prospectus Section 8)

Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements:

- 1) The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission on the institution and the scope of its programs and services. (Substantive Change Committee Report 2.11.1)
- 2) The legal authority and operating control of the institution are clearly defined in the institution's governance structure for the fiscal stability of the institution. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.2.2.2)
- 3) The institution's recent financial history demonstrates financial stability. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.10.1)
- 4) The institution exercises appropriate control over all its physical resources. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.11.1)
- 5) The institution operates and maintains physical facilities, both on and off campus, that appropriately serve the needs of the institution's educational programs, support services, and other mission-related activities. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.10.3)

Miscellaneous Support: The college will provide additional support and resources necessary to meet the mission of the college and the requirements of the new program(s).

Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements:

- 1) The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission that promote student learning and enhance the development of its students. (Substantive Change Committee Report 2.10)

The college should provide a description of student development services specifically relevant to the new degree programs. (Core Requirements 10)

- 2) The institution provides appropriate academic support services. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.4.9)
- 3) The institution's use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs. Students have access to and training in the use of technology. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.4.12)
- 4) The institution employs qualified personnel to insure the quality and effectiveness of its student affairs programs. (Substantive Change Committee Report 3.9.3)
- 5) The institution has qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience, competence, and capacity to lead the institution. (Comprehensive Standard 3.2.8)

6) The institution provides appropriate academic support services. (Comprehensive Standard 3.4.9)

7) The institution's use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs. Students have access to and training in the use of technology. (Comprehensive Standard 3.4.12)

Appendix B

Historical Comparison of Upper Level Expenditures to Lower Level Expenditures in the State University System

Year	Level	SUS CREDIT HOURS	SUS TOTAL EXPENDITURES	SUS FTE	SUS TOTAL EXPENDITURES/ FTE	% SUS UPPER LEVEL ABOVE SUS LOWER LEVEL
06-07	Lower	2,738,901	515,103,758	91,297	5,642	
	Upper	3,506,777	962,109,016	116,893	8,231	46%
05-06	Lower	2,684,186	488,415,008	89,473	5,459	
	Upper	3,396,053	881,150,532	113,202	7,784	43%
04-05	Lower	2,597,213	442,279,266	86,574	5,109	
	Upper	3,256,627	824,353,490	108,554	7,594	49%
03-04	Lower	2,498,715	421,028,974	83,291	5,055	
	Upper	3,168,959	769,313,046	105,632	7,283	44%
02-03	Lower	2,388,493	400,813,807	79,616	5,034	
	Upper	3,040,396	742,960,599	101,347	7,331	46%
01-02	Lower	2,296,699	375,852,687	76,557	4,909	
	Upper	2,943,015	698,384,179	98,101	7,119	45%
00-01	Lower	2,146,987	372,263,267	71,566	5,202	
	Upper	2,781,136	714,252,278	92,705	7,705	48%
AVERAGE						45%

Appendix C

COMPARISON OF COLLEGE UPPER LEVEL TUITION TO COLLEGE LOWER LEVEL STANDARD TUITION

	COLLEGE UPPER LEVEL TUITION	COLLEGE STANDARD LOWER LEVEL	% COLLEGE UPPER LEVEL TUITION ABOVE COLLEGE LOWER LEVEL STANDARD TUITION
08-09	69.40	54.43	28%
07-08	65.47	51.35	27%
06-07	62.36	48.91	27%
05-06	60.84	47.72	27%
04-05	57.94	45.45	27%

Appendix D

FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM UPPER LEVEL APPROPRIATIONS 2001-02 THROUGH 2008-09

<u>COLLEGE</u>	<u>2001-02 APPROP.</u>	<u>2002-03 APPROP.</u>	<u>2003-04 APPROP.</u>	<u>2004-05 APPROP.</u>	<u>2005-06 APPROP.</u>	<u>2006-07 APPROP.</u>	<u>2007-08 APPROP.</u>	<u>2007-08 BASED ON OCTOBER 2007 APPROP.</u>	<u>2007-08 BASED ON MARCH 12, 2008 APPROP.</u>	<u>2008-09 APPROP.</u>
Saint Petersburg College	\$937,600	\$3,000,000 (1)	\$4,808,294	\$4,902,166 (2)	\$6,235,549	\$6,783,305	\$6,783,305 (3)	6,586,084	\$6,483,484	\$6,100,139 (5)
Broward College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75,000
Chipola College	0	497,500	333,333	662,440	662,440	662,440	662,440	643,179	633,160	603,223 (5)
Daytona State College	0	0	0	0	0	150,782	522,720	507,521	499,615	593,235 (5)
Edison College	0	999,902	333,333	135,016	0	56,837	116,150	112,773	111,016	153,487 (5)
Florida Community College at Jacksonville	0	0	0	0	0	75,580	46,464	45,113	44,410	88,398
Indian River State College	0	0	0	0	0	0	433,664 (4)	421,055	414,496	405,054 (5)
Miami Dade College	0	1,728,400	333,334	1,302,600	721,056	1,118,582	1,244,351	1,208,171	1,189,353	1,162,262 (5)
Northwest Florida State College	0	274,198	0	264,938	338,902	445,052	472,901 (4)	459,151	451,999	441,703 (5) (6)
Palm Beach Community College										15,000
TOTAL (CURRENT PROGRAMS)	\$937,600	\$6,500,000	\$5,808,294	\$7,267,160	\$7,957,947	\$9,292,578	\$10,281,995	\$9,983,047	\$9,827,533	\$9,637,501

NOTES:

- (1) The amount of \$3,000,000 was originally granted in the 2001-02 Appropriation.
- (2) Excludes non-recurring funds for Saint Petersburg College Library Enhancements in the amount of \$500,000.
- (3) Saint Petersburg College did not request this amount, the appropriation was maintained to allow them to grow into their enrollment of 1,795.
- (4) Excludes non-recurring funds for Indian River Community College in the amount of \$750,000; and Northwest Florida State College in the amount of \$500,000.
- (5) Excludes the amount of \$40,000 per college for the State College Pilot Project.
- (6) Excludes the amount of \$500,000 appropriated for Northwest Florida State College Program Expansion.
- (7) The amount of \$15,000 was appropriated for the State College Pilot Project.

**FLORIDA COLLEGE SYSTEM
UPPER LEVEL APPROPRIATIONS
2001-02 THROUGH 2008-09**

Non-Recurring Appropriations

COLLEGE	2001-02 APPROP.	2002-03 APPROP.	2003-04 APPROP.	2004-05 APPROP.	2005-06 APPROP.	2006-07 APPROP.	2007-08 APPROP.	2007-08	2007-08	2008-09
								BASED ON OCTOBER 2007 APPROP.	BASED ON MARCH 12, 2008 APPROP.	APPROP.
Saint Petersburg College	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	\$0	\$40,000
Broward College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chipola College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40,000
Daytona State College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40,000
Edison College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40,000
Florida Community College at Jacksonville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indian River State College	0	0	0	0	0	0	750,000	0	0	40,000
Miami Dade College	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40,000
Northwest Florida State College	0	0	0	0	0	0	500,000	0	0	540,000
Palm Beach Community College										0
TOTAL (CURRENT PROGRAMS)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,250,000	\$0	\$0	\$780,000
State College Task Force										15,000 (7)

NOTE:

(7) The amount of \$15,000 was appropriated for the State College Pilot Project.

Appendix E

Synthesis of Conference Call for Florida College System Task Force Funding Options Workgroup Draft

October 21, 2008

1. **Overarching Goal.** The overarching goal of changes to the funding allocation model is to keep all colleges together as one system in a way that is fair, equitable, and accountable. The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup believes that a unified funding allocation model for a unified system is the most viable strategy.
2. **Current Funding Allocation Model.** The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup believes that the current funding allocation model has served the colleges well:
 - a) It recognizes institutional differences in academic programs and needs;
 - b) The colleges believe that the model is fair and equitable;
 - c) The model has been effective in both times when the economy and resource availability have been good and bad;
 - d) It is a living model that is reviewed annually by a state-wide committee and adjusted, as needed, to address identified concerns and reflect necessary changes.

The model has been adjusted when appropriate to:

- e) Provide stable funding when hurricanes affected many college campuses.
- f) Address the special needs of rural and isolated colleges.

The model is not perfect, some issues remain, including:

- g) Fully addressing equity issues among colleges.

3. **Recognition of Transition to Baccalaureate Programs.** The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup recognizes that there is a need for a transition methodology in the funding allocation model to accommodate institutions that are initiating new baccalaureate programs.
4. **Funding Allocation Model for Upper Level Enrollments.** The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup believes that the current funding allocation model can be adjusted to appropriately fund upper level instruction within the overall umbrella of one funding model.
5. **Enrollment Factor/Transition.** The current model using a three-year rolling average for enrollments, which are a primary funding model driver. Since not all of the new upper level courses associated with baccalaureate degrees have a three-year enrollment history, alternatives must be considered. Some options include:
 - a) Using projected enrollments with an accountability factor in the allocation model. As an example, institutions may project enrollment for three to five years, and at the end of this period a three year average, or the highest

year's enrollment could be used; however, a formula adjustment would be made for over or under projection.

- b) Start-up costs could be a funding model factor. First start-up funds could be allocated when the first time a college is approved to award baccalaureate degrees. Second, start-up funds could be allocated for new baccalaureate programs. Rather than using enrollment as a factor for the first three years of the transition to baccalaureate programs a start-up amount is added for each baccalaureate program based on first, second and third year costs with each college using a template that reflects differences in program costs by discipline. Then, the third year enrollment (assuming it is the highest enrollment) could be used, until the fifth year of the program when the 3-year rolling enrollment is the funding model allocation factor.
- c) A combination or variation of a) and b) above.

6. **Other Formula Factors.** The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup believes that all formula factors should be reviewed to determine the necessary adjustments for all costs associated with the implementation and operation of baccalaureate programs. The Funding Options Workgroup believes historical data on the cost differential between upper and lower division instruction in the state university system should be utilized in this determination.
7. **Accreditation.** The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup reviewed the requirements for accreditation and believes that changes to the allocation model should be consistent with adequately funding SACS-COC accreditation requirements and standards. These standards include, among others, the requirement that a minimum of 25% of the discipline course hours taught at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty with terminal degrees in each program discipline area.
8. **Legislation.** The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup reviewed pertinent, existing Florida legislation that requires baccalaureate degrees at state colleges be more affordable than at the State University System. State law requires recurring funds before programs can begin accepting students.
9. **Fees.** The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup believes that the colleges should have flexibility in charging tuition and in the use of fee revenues associated with the baccalaureate programs. Current legislation requires that the fees be less than those charged by the State University System.
10. **Planning.** The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup discussed the need for a statewide plan that address which baccalaureate programs are needed by discipline and geographic area to meet the state's workforce needs. The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup also discussed the importance of estimating the overall costs associated with these programs. The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup recognizes that the statutory responsibility for baccalaureate programmatic decisions, subsequent to the initial baccalaureate degree, rests with each college's Board of Trustees. (Note: within the Board of Governor's section of the law, there is a provision that criteria established by the State Board of Education must be met. In addition, there is separate statutory language that addresses math and science baccalaureate degree programs that includes a detailed review and approval process by the State Board of Education).

11. **PECO Funding.** The Task Force Funding Options Workgroup recommends a review and possible modification of statutory language related to PECO funding to accommodate the subsequent capital outlay needs associated with the expansion of baccalaureate programming in the Florida College System.

Questions that may arise:

- a) What is the history of projected vs. actual enrollments for baccalaureate programs? Have any of the projected enrollments been fully funded?
- b) What have institutions received for start-up funding in the past and what is the rationale for these allocations of funds?
- c) Should degrees produced be an accountability or performance factor (Note; an emerging trend in funding throughout the country is to move toward funding degrees, rather than enrollments, particularly at the baccalaureate level)?
- d) Should multiple variations on the identified funding option be presented?

Appendix F

**Florida College System Task Force
Funding Options Workgroup
Tuesday, October 21, 2008; 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

Members

Bill Law, Chair (TCC)
Kathy Johnson (PHCC)
Ann McGee (SCC)
David Armstrong (BC)
Judy Genshaft (USF) * not present

Others Present

Kasongo Butler (DCC)
Judith Bilsky (DCC)
John Holdnak (DCC)
Chuck Prince (DCC)
Lisa Cook (DCC)
Helen Levine (USF) *for Genshaft
Don Payton (SCC)
Brenda Albright (Task Force Consultant)

Guiding Principles for Funding Discussions

- Any changes to funding strategy or methodology should remain consistent with adequately funding SACS-COC accreditation requirements and standards.
- Similar programs and activities at system colleges should be funded equitably.
- Considered funding strategies or methodologies must support the concept of remaining one “28-college system.”
- Colleges must continue to support and be committed to the traditional community college mission and funding must reflect that commitment.
- Total state funding for state college system programs and activities must remain lower than similar costs in the state university system.

Discussion

Law

- As we write the report, one system/one funding formula should be used as the basis.
- The CC funding allocation model has served institutions well.
- The Workgroup is not at point of dismissing Option 2 on pg. 17 (New Model for Funding Basis) of State College Pilot Project (SCPP) report.
- Hurricane funding: colleges were held harmless on their FTE numbers for short time; everyone wanted the money in the formula.
- He thinks the Workgroup wants to get away from using the 85% tie-in to the state university system.
- He thinks Pg. 17 (SCPP) 1.1a indicates the Pilot College Group wanted 85% of SUS funding minus research.
- The president’s salary and some other similar costs are already built into funding formula and shouldn’t change because the college begins offering upper level programs.

Johnson

- Agrees with the CC funding allocation model; it is flexible.
- There’s variation of program mix included in the Pilot College’s approach to baccalaureate funding, but they want it based on projected enrollment; this isn’t inline with CC funding in Florida and can quickly become inequitable to those who don’t offer baccalaureate programs at this time.
- Do we try to roll baccalaureate programs into funding formula? If that is our recommendation, schools have to abide by nuances of the formula!
- The SUS may want to look in that direction also because they wouldn’t be spending the money on baccalaureate students that won’t be attending their institutions.
- If the model is to be based on projected enrollment at the baccalaureate level, it should be based on projected enrollment at the associate degree level as well.

- It would be appropriate to give three years to build up data on enrollments—this allows for benchmarking.
- We need to hold colleges accountable for projected FTE each year but fund for projected enrollment, if FTE projections aren't met, the colleges should give back the excess funding for the unrealized FTE; at end of three years, we should utilize the total actual enrollment of programs and start using them in formula for funding.
- One of the problems as she sees it is that every year a baccalaureate degree offering institution can just start another baccalaureate degree—there needs to be a way everyone can meet a benchmark.
- Maybe there is/can be a template for start-up cost
- She indicated she was very concerned by the idea of using PECO resources to fund student housing and the like.

McGee

- If goal is to keep system together, we do that with common formula; if goal is to have a tiered system, have different funding formulas for baccalaureate colleges and associate colleges.
- Senator Lynn called for over-funded baccalaureate schools to give back funds for unrealized enrollments.
- He was not in favor of moving forward with a projection model.
- If the new model we are looking at is based on a 3-year enrollment average, perhaps we should look at doing two years of actual enrollment and one year of projected.
- If a college doesn't make its enrollment projection, they should have to give funds back to discourage over-projecting.
- We aren't getting 100% of funding for lower-division work now; how does money not come off the top to fund what they need for baccalaureate degrees.
- We should tie funding back to specific fields and let that determine what degrees CCs offer.

Holdnak

- The Pilot College Group is looking to use total cost of instruction rather than direct instructional cost per FTE as the tie in to state university funding.
- Current statutory language sets the maximum a baccalaureate college can get at 85% of the direct instruction cost (which equates to about 69% of SUS total cost of instruction, if they get full funding)—The Legislature did not fully fund the request for baccalaureate degree funding in community colleges last year.
- When looking at upper level funding in the SUS v. baccalaureate colleges, the baccalaureate colleges get about \$3,000-\$4000 less per FTE.
- We've been told the BOG uses three year range; a new program must have accurate projections and is held harmless for the first three years, and after that the funding per FTE reverts back to actual enrollments.

Prince

- The Legislative Budget request was for \$3,657 per FTE in funding for baccalaureate programs. The Legislature did not fund the projected FTE at the requested level. For the current year the requested level of funding per FTE is was approximately \$300 more than the funding for lower level FTE.

Bilsky

- What if basic startup funding was provided for the first baccalaureate program at a college (to handle SACS-related costs, initial hiring, marketing, etc...) and not at the same level for subsequent programs? Any startup costs for additional baccalaureate programs would be absorbed by the college (like current situation).

Law

- Upper-division costs differ from lower-division for several reasons including differences in the accreditation requirements that must be met. For instance, colleges must have 25% of instruction in a particular academic discipline taught by faculty with a terminal degree in that discipline.
- He thinks that tying our funding to an 85% SUS standard will bite us in the end.
- Perhaps if FTE is over-subscribed, maybe colleges can use the best three years of enrollment out of five or six.
- He thought the Workgroup should find out how startup cost were handled for existing baccalaureate programs.
- He suggested that it would be appropriate to hear from the Legislature on how much new baccalaureate education the state is willing to fund.
- He will work with Holdnak and Prince to develop a draft model based on the Workgroups discussions and a phase-in scenario for program in order to get real FTE driving program funding as rapidly as makes sense (may not be actual in 1st year).
- He thinks that by the legislative allocation process in 2010, we can have identified, run simulations and reached agreement on how to incorporate baccalaureate-related issues and specialty nuances into the existing funding allocation model.
- He indicated he likes the Pilot Colleges' "A New Funding Model" (p.17 of their draft report) even though it was rejected by them as a viable alternative.
- He indicated he would be happy to have tuition and fees determined on a calculation basis for upper level courses and would like to see a set standard fee plus a range like we have for lower level course tuition now.

Appendix G

FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM BACHELORS DEGREE PROGRAM FUNDED-30, UPPER LEVEL FUNDING PER FTE

APPROPRIATIONS

COLLEGE	ACTUAL 2005-2006	ACTUAL 2006-07	ORIGINAL 2007-08	REVISED 2007-08	ACTUAL 2008-09
Broward	0	0	0	0	75,000
Chipola	662,440	662,440	662,440	633,160	603,223
Daytona Beach	0	150,782	522,720	499,615	593,235
Edison	0	56,837	116,150	111,016	153,487
Fla. CC @ Jax	0	75,580	46,464	44,410	88,398
Indian River	0	0	433,664	414,496	405,054
Miami-Dade	721,056	1,118,582	1,244,351	1,189,353	1,162,262
Okaloosa-Walton	338,902	445,052	472,901	451,999	441,703
Palm Beach	0	0	0	0	15,000
St. Petersburg	6,235,549	6,783,305	6,783,305	6,483,484	6,100,139
TOTAL	7,957,947	9,292,578	10,281,995	9,827,533	9,637,501

FUNDED FTE

COLLEGE	FUNDED 2005-2006	FUNDED 2006-07	FUNDED 2007-08	FUNDED 2007-08	FUNDED 2008-09
Broward	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
Chipola	80.0	40.0	48.9	48.9	175.3
Daytona Beach	0.0	38.0	135.0	135.0	323.3
Edison	37.0	35.0	30.0	30.0	124.0
Fla. CC @ Jax	0.0	20.0	12.0	12.0	106.5
Indian River	0.0	0.0	112.0	112.0	503.0
Miami-Dade	191.0	296.0	321.4	321.4	573.8
Okaloosa-Walton	84.0	111.0	122.2	122.2	232.9
Palm Beach	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
St. Petersburg	1,615.0	1,795.0	1,795.0	1,795.0	1,795.0
TOTAL	2,007.0	2,335.0	2,576.5	2,576.5	3,893.8

FUNDING PER FTE

COLLEGE	2005-2006	2006-07	2007-08 ORIGINAL	2007-08 REVISED	2008-09
Broward	0	0	0	0	1,250
Chipola	8,281	16,561	13,539	12,940	3,441
Daytona Beach	0	3,968	3,872	3,701	1,835
Edison	0	1,624	3,872	3,701	1,238
Fla. CC @ Jax	0	0	3,872	3,701	830
Indian River	0	0	3,872	3,701	805
Miami-Dade	3,775	3,779	3,872	3,701	2,026
Okaloosa-Walton	4,035	4,009	3,871	3,700	1,897
Palm Beach	0	0	0	0	0
St. Petersburg	3,861	3,779	3,779	3,612	3,398
SYSTEM AVERAGE FUNDING PER FTE	3,965	3,979	3,991	3,814	2,475

REQUESTED UPPER-LEVEL STATE REVENUE PER FTE	3,779	3,779	3,872	3,701	3,657
--	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

Lower-level Funded State Revenue per FTE	3,491	3,851		3,671	3,307
---	--------------	--------------	--	--------------	--------------