

Public University Support Fund (PUSF) and Growth Scenarios

DRAFT ESTIMATES

Question: How much of a recurring budget gap would exist if the resident undergraduate tuition increase were limited to 5%?

- Assumes \$11.6 million of budget cuts implemented in FY20

	\$40.5 million increase to PUSF (co-chairs budget)	\$60 million increase to PUSF	\$80 million increase to PUSF	\$120 million increase to PUSF
90% Success on Non Resident Growth Target (+163 NR)	(\$15.3 million)	(\$13.5 million)	(\$11.6 million)	(\$7.5 million)
95% Success on Non-Resident Growth Target (+277 NR)	(\$11.9 million)	(\$10.1 million)	(\$8.2 million)	(\$4.1 million)
100% Success on Non-Resident Growth Target (+390NR)	(\$8.4 million)	(\$6.6 million)	(\$4.7 million)	(\$0.6 million)

Question: What would it take to balance remaining FY20 budget gap solely through resident undergraduate tuition increases?

- Assumes \$11.6 million of budget cuts implemented in FY20

	\$40.5 million increase to PUSF (co-chairs budget)	\$60 million increase to PUSF	\$80 million increase to PUSF	\$120 million increase to PUSF
90% Success on Non Resident Growth Target (+163 NR)	22.5%	20.5%	17.5%	13.5%
95% Success on Non-Resident Growth Target (+277 NR)	18.5%	16.5%	14.0%	9.0%
100% Success on Non-Resident Growth Target (+390 NR)	15.0%	12.5%	10.0%	5.0%

NOTE: A 1% tuition increase on resident undergraduate tuition generates approximately \$750,000. The FY20 PERS increase is estimated at \$7.1M. Thus, the PERS increase alone would equal a 9.47% increase in resident undergraduate tuition if that cost were to be borne entirely by this means.