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Summary Overview

• How Colleges Spend Money website data is **not** comparable over time.

• Compared to peers, CU Boulder and UCCS are **in-line or below the median of peers** when looking at operational funds (E&G) spending per student.

• **Institutional support** growth has occurred in:
  • Administrative demand functions in HR and OIT centralized services.
  • Compliance with federal rules, data security, and research requirements.
  • IT expenditures and personnel requirements due to internet security and software updates.

• Compared to peers, CU campuses have:
  • Lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.
  • Lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.
“Due to a change in the NCES Finance Survey in 2016, per-student expenditure data for 2016 and later years are not necessarily comparable with data from prior to 2016.”

(howcollegesspendmoney.com)

- From 2010 to 2015, three expenses were subtracted from Institutional Support (Depreciation, Interest, and Operation and Maintenance of Plant).

- IPEDS modified data collection in 2016, integrating these expenses into the institutional support category resulting in an increased expenditures.
CU BOULDER
CU Boulder, Institutional Support Per Student

Data from howcollegesspendmoney.com

“Due to a change in the NCES Finance Survey in 2016, per-student expenditure data for 2016 and later years are not necessarily comparable with data from prior to 2016.”
(howcollegesspendmoney.com)
CU Boulder, Institutional Support Per Student
40% below howcollegesspendmoney.com

- Green dotted line (All Funds) corrects to normalize IPEDS data overtime
- Gray line adjusts to look at operating funds (E&G) only

Note: The green line is not comparable over time.
CU Boulder Institutional Support **All Fund Expenses**
(Operating + Auxiliary + Restricted)
per SFTE Compared to Peers FY 2018-19

Lower ranking means less spending compared to peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>% from Median (+above / -below)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAC-12</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>3 of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>15 of 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7 of 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagships</td>
<td>+5%</td>
<td>28 of 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click on Peer Group to see a detailed comparison.
CU Boulder
Institutional Support **Operating Fund Expenses**
per SFTE Compared to Peers FY 2018-19

CU Boulder is in-line or below median expenditure
Lower ranking means less spending compared to peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>% from Median ( +above / -below )</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAC-12</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>4 of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>+3%</td>
<td>17 of 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>-34%</td>
<td>4 of 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagships</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>21 of 48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click on Peer Group to see a detailed comparison.

Methodology: IPEDS Finance Survey includes all funds (Operating, Auxiliary, and Restricted). To estimate Operating funds from total funds, the methodology on the right is used.

\[
\text{Estimated Operating Expenditures per SFTE} = \left(\frac{\text{State Appropriation + Tuition Revenue}}{\text{IPEDS Revenue (All Funds)}}\right) \times \text{Total IPEDS Expenditures (All Funds) per SFTE}
\]
CU Boulder Staffing Ratios  
Rank Compared to Peers FY 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>(A) Percent Faculty of Total Employees</th>
<th>(B) Student-to-Staff Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>7 of 34</td>
<td>11 of 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>3 of 11</td>
<td>7 of 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC-12</td>
<td>3 of 12</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagships</td>
<td>11 of 50</td>
<td>21 of 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Lower ranking means a higher percent share of faculty compared to total employees and less staff compared to total employees.

(B) Lower ranking means fewer staff per student.
CU Boulder, Change in Administrative Costs
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, (no adjustments for inflation or enrollment)

- **E&G Growth:** $28.7 million
  - People: $18.8 million
  - Operating: $2.1 million
  - Other: $2.8 million
- **Non-E&G Growth:** $6.37 million
  - People: $1.8 million
  - Operating: $3.8 million
  - Other: $0.8 million

(In Millions)
• **Technology Modernization and Demand Growth ($4.2 million, 72 FTE):** Expansion of HR and OIT centralized services, advancing efforts in data integration, dedicated desktop support, and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) efforts which support the entire business systems IT environment.

• **Finance and Compliance ($1.4 million, 17 FTE):** Maintain functional support for growing revenue and increasing compliance requirements, including cyber security laws and regulations for digital accessibility and captioning services.

• **Equity and Community Engagement ($300,000, 4 FTE):** Investments to support campus-wide efforts, adding leadership and support to enable growth.

• **Development ($4.5 million, 42 FTE):** Campus investment to supplement Foundation support as a way to increase dollars raised.

• **Data Analytics and Marketing ($1.9 million, 22 FTE):** Investments in marketing to leverage evolving social and digital media platforms to reach prospective students to meet enrollment numbers.

• **Total compensation increases ($6.5 million):** Cost increase from annual merit pool ($1.1 million) and benefits ($5.4 million).
CU Boulder, Change in Operating
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $2.1 million E&G

• **Technology Modernization ($2.1 million):**
  Investments in a new Land Mobile Radio system for special events, unplanned emergencies, and daily communications between departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCA</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>$18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(no adjustments for inflation or enrollment)
CU Boulder, Change in Other & ICCA
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $7.8 million E&G

- Increases in general liability insurance ($2.8 million)
- ICCA ($5 million): System office change resulting from campus activity and System initiatives

(no adjustments for inflation or enrollment)
UCCS, Institutional Support Per Student
Data from howcollegesspendmoney.com

“Due to a change in the NCES Finance Survey in 2016, per-student expenditure data for 2016 and later years are not necessarily comparable with data from prior to 2016.” (howcollegesspendmoney.com)
UCCS, Institutional Support Per Student
33% below howcollegesspendmoney.com

- Green dotted line (All Funds) corrects to normalize IPEDS data overtime
- Gray line adjusts to look at operating funds (E&G) only

Note: The green line is not comparable over time.
UCCS Institutional Support **All Fund Expenses** (Operating + Auxiliary + Restricted) per SFTE Compared to Peers FY 2018-19

Lower ranking means less spending compared to peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>% from Median (+above / -below)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCHE 2011</td>
<td>+24%</td>
<td>22 of 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>+15%</td>
<td>7 of 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click on Peer Group to see a detailed comparison.
## UCCS Institutional Support Operating Fund Expenses

per SFTE Compared to Peers FY 2018-19

Lower ranking means less spending compared to peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>% from Median (+above / -below)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCHE 2011</td>
<td>-29%</td>
<td>7 of 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6 of 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Click on Peer Group to see a detailed comparison.

Methodology: IPEDS Finance Survey includes all funds (Operating, Auxiliary, and Restricted). To estimate Operating funds from total funds, the methodology on the right is used.

\[
\text{Estimated Operating Expenditures per SFTE} = \left( \frac{\text{State Appropriation + Tuition Revenue}}{\text{IPEDS Revenue (All Funds)}} \right) \times \left( \frac{\text{Total IPEDS Expenditures (All Funds) per SFTE}}{\text{IPEDS Revenue (All Funds)}} \right)
\]
UCCS Staffing Ratios
Rank Compared to Peers FY 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>(A) Percent Faculty of Total Employees</th>
<th>(B) Student-to-Staff Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCHE 2011</td>
<td>9 of 31</td>
<td>6 of 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>3 of 11</td>
<td>3 of 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Lower ranking means a higher percent share of faculty compared to total employees and less staff compared to total employees.

(B) Lower ranking means fewer staff per student.
UCCS, Change in Administrative Costs
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, (no adjustments for inflation or enrollment)

- E&G Growth: $5.6 million
  - People, $3.1 million
  - ICCA, $1.5 million
  - Operating, $1.0 million
- Non-E&G Growth: $1.4 million
  - Operating, $0.7 million
  - Other, $0.7 million

(In Millions)
UCCS, Change in FTE
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19

Restructuring of Offices, 10.0
Advancement, 1.5
UCCS Presents, Downtown Presence, 5.2
Compliance, 2.0

E&G Total Growth: 18.7
UCCS, Change in People
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $3.1 million E&G

• **UCCS Presents and Downtown Presence ($220,000, 5.2 FTE):** Ent Center for Arts opened and staffing was increased for business operations. $20,000 for downtown marketing

• **Restructuring of Offices ($630,000, 10.0 FTE):** Student Financial Services office, Registrar office, and Human Resources office were restructured to meet our mission, react to changing needs/compliance, and create efficiencies. New Budget & Planning position for new budget model and software

• **Advancement ($124,000, 1.5 FTE):** Alumni Support Services to help raise funds

• **Compliance ($113,000, 2.0 FTE):** General fund support of Intercollegiate Athletics due to compliance demands

• **Total compensation increases ($2.0 million):** Cost increase from annual merit pool ($0.8 million) and benefits ($1.2 million).
UCCS, Change in Operating
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $1.0 million E&G

- **Increase in marketing efforts ($50,000):** Marketing efforts for both recruitment and business ventures.

- **Continued increases in technology ($300,000):** Online initiative expenses and costs to meet current technology expectations.

- **Other Operating ($600,000):** Other operating expenses, including insurance services and dues & membership fees.
UCCS, Change in Other & ICCA
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $1.5 million E&G

- **ICCA ($1.5 million):** Increase in support of system office

  (no adjustments for inflation or enrollment)
CU DENVER | ANSCHUTZ
CU Denver|Anschutz, Institutional Support Per Student
Data from howcollegesspendmoney.com

“Due to a change in the NCES Finance Survey in 2016, per-student expenditure data for 2016 and later years are not necessarily comparable with data from prior to 2016.”
(howcollegesspendmoney.com)

Note: UCD IPEDS submission combines Denver and Anschutz
CU Denver|Anschutz, Institutional Support Per Student
23% below howcollegesspendmoney.com

- Green dotted line (All Funds) adjusts to normalize for IPEDS data change
- Gray line adjusts to look at operating funds (E&G) only

Advancement transferred from the CU Foundation to the campuses in July 2013.

How Colleges Spend Money
- $2,663
- $3,508
- $1,008
- 22.9% below

Four Campuses United
CU Denver Staffing Ratios
Rank Compared to Peers FY 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>(A) Percent Faculty of Total Employees</th>
<th>(B) Student-to-Staff Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCHE 2011</td>
<td>2 of 12</td>
<td>5 of 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>1 of 11</td>
<td>4 of 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Lower ranking means a higher percent share of faculty compared to total employees and less staff compared to total employees.

(B) Lower ranking means fewer staff per student.

Note: Denver Faculty & Staff counts from CU Denver IR published reporting
CU Anschutz Staffing Ratios
Rank Compared to Peers FY 2018-19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Group</th>
<th>(A) Percent Faculty of Total Employees</th>
<th>(B) Student-to-Staff Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCHE 2011</td>
<td>1 of 7</td>
<td>4 of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>1 of 9</td>
<td>6 of 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Lower ranking means a higher percent share of faculty compared to total employees and less staff compared to total employees.

(B) Lower ranking means fewer staff per student.

Note: Anschutz Faculty & Staff counts from CU Denver IR published reporting.
CU Denver|Anschutz, Change in Administrative Costs
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, (no adjustments for inflation or enrollment)

- E&G Growth: $11.4 million
  - Operating, $1.1 million
  - Other, $1.4 million
  - ICCA, $3.5 million
- Non-E&G Growth: $3.7 million
  - People, $2.5 million
  - Operating, $0.6 million
  - Other, $0.5 million
CU Denver|Anschutz, Change in FTE
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19

Non-E&G Growth:
- Advancement, 12 FTE
- Non-E&G Growth: 12 FTE

E&G Growth:
- Marketing and Communications, 7
- IT Compliance and Staff, 2
- CU Online OIT Staff, 9
- Other, 7
- E&G Growth: 25 FTE

Non-E&G
-E&G
CU Denver|Anschutz, Change in People
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $5.4 million E&G

- **Marketing and Communications ($750,000, 7.0 FTE):** Enhancing digital marketing efforts, distinct campus branding, and distinct website initiatives

- **IT Compliance and Staff ($200,000, 2.0 FTE):** 2 FTE support IT security, risk and compliance

- **CU Online OIT Staff ($1.0 million, 9.0 FTE):** CU Online programs grew, requiring a corresponding increase through a dedicated instructional design team and additional personnel for technology support of the teaching and learning platform

- **Other ($810,000, 7.0 FTE):** Staff for shared and campus-specific administration, including additional HR personnel in Learning and Development, Recruitment and Background Checks (to support a 15% increase in employee headcount between FY2016 and FY2019) as well as dedicated campus-specific Budget Office Personnel

- **Total compensation increases ($2.7 million):** Cost increase from annual merit pool ($800,000 million) and benefits ($1.9 million)
Prior Growth of the CU South Denver campus ($376,000): Increased operating expenditures for the facility and activities such as general office related operating, information technology software and equipment, and growth in auxiliary operations to support the meeting and event business as well as the Museum, Theater, and Bookstore.

Additional costs for IT mandatory software increases ($712,000): Security and Compliance software.
CU Denver|Anschutz, Change in Other & ICCA
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $4.9 million E&G

- **CU’s Technology Transfer operations ($505,000):** Decentralized in July 2016, resulting in an Anschutz Campus specific CU Innovations office established in FY 2016-17.

- **ICCA campus contribution ($3.5 million):** ERP Finance and HCM system upgrades and increases in System Office infrastructure and costs.

- Increased use of the **Employee Tuition Benefit ($600,000)**

- **Insurance premium expenses ($300,000)**

(no adjustments for inflation or enrollment)
CU System Office, Change in ICCA Budget
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, (no adjustments for inflation or enrollment)

- People, $6.8 million
- Operating, $3.2 million
- Total Growth: $10.0 million

ICCA
- Boulder: $5.0 million
- UCCS: $1.5 million
- + Denver|Anschutz: $3.5 million
- Total: $10.0 million
CU System Office, Change in FTE
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19

Source: CU System Office Budget & Finance
CU System Office, Change In People
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $6.8 million

- **University Counsel ($944,000, 5.2 FTE):** Increase campus legal needs driven by increase compliance and entrepreneurial activities

- **UIS ($1.7 million, 19.8 FTE):** 13 new positions for implementation of new HR and Finance system, 1 new Customer Relationship Management position, and 1.5 new research reporting (eRA) positions. 4.3 positions were transferred from other departments to UIS

- **Procurement Service Center ($0, -2.0 FTE):** Reduction of 1 FTE Executive Assistant and 1 FTE refinanced to non-E&G fund sources

- **IT Security ($140,000, 4.2 FTE):** 2 FTE moved from UIS, 1 FTE transferred from Litigation/Risk, 1 new IT Security Analyst

- **Internal Audit ($107,000, 1.0 FTE):** New Senior IT Auditor to address increased needs for data analytics and information security skills.

Note: Dollar amount only reflects the new additive FTE cost to a division or unit. FTE amount reflects the net FTE change to a division or unit.
CU System Office, Change In People
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $6.8 million

- **Employee Services ($291,000, 0.3 FTE):** Implementation of new HR and Finance system, transfer of staff to other E&G and non-E&G fund sources

- **Budget and Finance ($0, -0.3 FTE):** Refinanced to non-E&G fund source

- **Board of Regents ($106,000, 1.0 FTE):** New Special Assistant position to assist the Board Secretary

- **Academic Affairs ($99,000, 0.0 FTE):** Salary market adjustments

- **Total compensation increases ($3.4 million):** Cost increase from merit pool ($2.8 million) and benefits ($559,000)

Note: Dollar amount only reflects the new additive FTE cost to a division or unit. FTE amount reflects the net FTE change to a division or unit.
CU System Office, Change in Operating
FY 2015-16 to FY 2018-19, $3.2 million

- **System Administration Pooled Operating ($75,000):** Patient Centered Outcome Research Institute (PCORI) fee, RTD Eco-Pass, CRM credit for future spending
- **University Relations ($48,000):** CRM costs
- **UIS ($2.8 million):** UIS Hardware and Software
- **Procurement Service Center ($39,000):** Concur service agreement increase
- **IT Security ($126,000):** IT maintenance contracts
- **Internal Audit ($5,000):** Service contracts
- **Employee Services ($68,000):** Multi-state tax services.
- **Academic Affairs ($45,000):** Taking Student Success to Scale (TS3) Initiative, University of the Arctic membership, and Open Educational Resources (OER)
Conclusions

• How Colleges Spend Money website data is *not* comparable over time.

• Compared to peers, CU Boulder and UCCS are in-line or below the median of peers when looking at operational funds (E&G) spending per student.

• **Institutional support** growth has occurred in:
  • Administrative demand functions in HR and OIT centralized services.
  • Compliance with federal rules, data security, and research requirements.
  • IT expenditures and personnel requirements due to internet security and software updates.

• Compared to peers, CU campuses have:
  • Lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.
  • Lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.
What is Institutional Support?

Institutional Support is a NACUBO expense category = Administrative Costs

- **Executive management, compliance, and long-range planning** (e.g. president/chancellor, vice-presidents/vice-chancellors, legal office)
- **Fiscal operations** (e.g. accounting office, bursar and audit)
- **Logistical services** (e.g. personnel, procurement and communications)
- **Computing support** (e.g. computer support/UIS)
- **Public Relations/development** (e.g. university affairs and advancement)
Where is Institutional Support reported?

- The Federal Department of Education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) – total funds.

- The Colorado Department of Higher Education’s Budget Data Books (BDB) – E&G only.

- CU’s annual budget as an expenditure category – all fund types.
What can Institutional Support tell us?

• How has spending on this area changed at CU?

• What did CU buy with the expenditure?

• How does this compare to CCHE defined Peers?
CU Boulder vs AAU Peers
Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance and 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
CU Boulder vs Hanover Peers
Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance and 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research

Back to Presentation
CU Boulder vs PAC-12
Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance and 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
CU Boulder vs Flagship Universities
Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance and 12-Month Enrollment Surveys; IPEDS Data for Pennsylvania and Delaware are unavailable; Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research

Back to Presentation
CU Boulder vs AAU Peers
Estimated Operating Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance Survey, 2011-2019 Expenditures (All funds); Operating Expenditures include things like instruction, student services, and scholarships. To estimate operating funds from total funds, the methodology on the right is used.

\[
\text{Estimated Operating Expenditures per SFTE} = \left( \frac{\text{State Appropriation} + \text{Tuition Revenue}}{\text{IPEDS Revenue (All Funds)}} \right) \times \text{Total IPEDS Expenditures (All Funds) per SFTE}
\]
CU Boulder vs Hanover Peers
Estimated Operating Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance Survey, 2011-2019 Expenditures (All funds); Operating Expenditures include things like instruction, student services, and scholarships. To estimate operating funds from total funds, the methodology on the right is used.

\[
\text{Estimated Operating Expenditures per SFTE} = \left( \frac{\text{State Appropriation} + \text{Tuition Revenue}}{\text{IPEDS Revenue (All Funds)}} \right) \times \text{Total IPEDS Expenditures (All Funds) per SFTE}
\]
CU Boulder vs PAC-12
Estimated Operating Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance Survey, 2011-2019 Expenditures (All funds);
Operating Expenditures include things like instruction, student services, and
scholarships. To estimate operating funds from total funds, the methodology
on the right is used.

\[
\text{State Appropriation + Tuition Revenue} \times \frac{\text{Total IPEDS Expenditures (All Funds)}}{\text{IPEDS Revenue (All Funds)}} = \text{Estimated Operating Expenditures per SFTE}
\]
CU Boulder vs Flagship Universities
Estimated Operating Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance Survey, 2011-2019 Expenditures (All funds); Operating Expenditures include things like instruction, student services, and scholarships. To estimate operating funds from total funds, the methodology on the right is used.

\[
\text{Estimated Operating Expenditures per SFTE} = \left( \frac{\text{State Appropriation} + \text{Tuition Revenue}}{\text{IPEDS Revenue (All Funds)}} \right) \times \text{Total IPEDS Expenditures (All Funds) per SFTE}
\]
Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff Survey
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff Survey
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
CU Boulder vs PAC-12
% Faculty of Total Employees

Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff Survey
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
CU Boulder vs Flagship Universities
% Faculty of Total Employees

Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff Survey
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
Compared to peers, CU campuses have lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff & 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
Compared to peers, CU campuses have lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff & 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
CU Boulder vs PAC-12
Student-to-Staff Ratio (SFTE / # Staff)

Compared to peers, CU campuses have lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.
Compared to peers, CU campuses have lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff & 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
UCCS vs CCHE 2011 Peers
Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS 2019, Finance and 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
UCCS vs Hanover Peers
Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS 2019, Finance and 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
UCCS vs CCHE 2011 Peers
Estimated Operating Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance Survey, 2011-2019 Expenditures (All funds); Operating Expenditures include things like instruction, student services, and scholarships. To estimate operating funds from total funds, the methodology on the right is used.

\[
\text{State Appropriation + Tuition Revenue} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{IPEDS Revenue (All Funds)} \\
\end{array} \right] \quad \ast \quad \text{Total IPEDS Expenditures (All Funds) per SFTE} = \text{Estimated Operating Expenditures per SFTE}
\]
Estimated Operating Institutional Support Expenditures per SFTE

Source: IPEDS Finance Survey, 2011-2019 Expenditures (All funds); Operating Expenditures include things like instruction, student services, and scholarships. To estimate operating funds from total funds, the methodology on the right is used.

\[
\text{Estimated Operating Expenditures per SFTE} = \left( \frac{\text{State Appropriation} + \text{Tuition Revenue}}{\text{IPEDS Revenue (All Funds)}} \right) \times \text{Total IPEDS Expenditures (All Funds) per SFTE}
\]
Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.
Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff Survey
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
Compared to peers, CU campuses have lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff & 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
Compared to peers, CU campuses have lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.
CU Denver vs 2011 CCHE Peers
% Faculty of Faculty & Staff

Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff Survey, Denver # provided by IR
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.
### CU Denver vs CCHE 2011 Peers

**Student-to-Staff Ratio (SFTE / # Staff)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>SFTE / # Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northern AZ</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UMass Lowell</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Portland State</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CU Denver</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UMass Boston</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cleveland State</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>North Carolina Greensboro</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Missouri St Louis</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Wichita St</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to peers, CU campuses have lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.

Source: IPEDS 2019, Fall Staff & 12-Month Enrollment Surveys

Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
## CU Denver vs Hanover Peers

### Student-to-Staff Ratio (SFTE / # Staff)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Portland State</th>
<th>North Texas</th>
<th>FLAtlantic</th>
<th>CU Denver</th>
<th>Akron</th>
<th>North Carolina Charlotte</th>
<th>Georgia State University</th>
<th>Memphis</th>
<th>Wayne State University</th>
<th>SUNY at Albany</th>
<th>Indiana University-Purdue Indianapolis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to peers, CU campuses have lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.

Source: IPEDS 2019, Fall Staff & 12-Month Enrollment Surveys
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff, Anschutz # from campus IR
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
## CU Anschutz vs Hanover Peers

### % Faculty of Faculty & Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>% Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CU Anschutz</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstate Medical University</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Medical</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Baltimore</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Medical</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health &amp; Science</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Health Sciences-San Antonio</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Health Sciences-Houston</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Medical</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to peers, CU campuses have a lower percent share of staff compared to total employees.

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff, Anschutz # from campus IR

Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research
Compared to peers, CU campuses have lower student-to-staff ratios, with fewer staff per student.
### CU Anschutz vs Hanover Peers

**Student-to-Staff Ratio (SFTE / # Staff)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>SFTE / Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upstate Medical University</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland, Baltimore</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina Medical</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Medical</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Health Sciences-San Antonio</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU Anschutz</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Medical</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Health Sciences-Houston</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health &amp; Science</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS 2019 Fall Staff & 12-Month Enrollment Survey
Data compiled by CU System Office of Institutional Research