

**Department of State  
Division of Publications**

312 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, 8th Floor Tennessee Tower  
Nashville, TN 37243  
Phone: 615-741-2650  
Fax: 615-741-5133  
Email: [sos.information@state.tn.us](mailto:sos.information@state.tn.us)

**For Department of State Use Only**

Sequence Number: 05-12-09  
Rule ID(s): 4204  
File Date: 05/14/09  
Effective Date: 07/28/09

# Rulemaking Hearing Rule(s) Filing Form

*Rulemaking Hearing Rules are rules filed after and as a result of a rulemaking hearing. TCA Section 4-5-205*

<b>Agency/Board/Commission:</b>	Tennessee Higher Education Commission
<b>Division:</b>	Division of Postsecondary School Authorization (DPSA)
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Julie M. Woodruff, Director of Regulatory Affairs for DPSA
<b>Address:</b>	404 James Robertson Parkway, Nashville, TN
<b>Zip:</b>	37243-0830
<b>Phone:</b>	(615)253-8857
<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:julie.woodruff@tn.gov">julie.woodruff@tn.gov</a>

**Revision Type (check all that apply):**

- Amendment  
 New  
 Repeal

**Rule(s) Revised (ALL chapters and rules contained in filing must be listed here. If needed, copy and paste additional tables. Please enter only ONE Rule Number/RuleTitle per row)**

Chapter Number	Chapter Title
1540-01-02	Authorization and Regulation of Postsecondary Education Institutions and Their Agents
Rule Number	Rule Title
1540-01-02-.25	Fees

Chapter 1540-01-02  
Authorization and Regulation of Postsecondary Education Institutions and Their Agents

Amendments

Rule 1540-01-02-.25 Fees, paragraphs (3) and (4) are amended by deleting the present language in its entirety and replacing it with the following:

(3) The fees to be collected by the Commission hereunder shall accompany an application for authorization to operate an institution or an application for an agent's permit, or other application required by these rules in accordance with the following schedule:

(a)	Late Renewal Fee (in addition to base renewal fee)	\$1,000
(b)	Renewal Extension Fee (in addition to base renewal fee)	\$500
(c)	Initial New School Application	\$3,000
	Each Proposed Program	\$500
(d)	Associate Degree Granting Institutions (in addition to base initial application and program fee)	\$1,000
(e)	Bachelor Degree Granting Institutions (in addition to base initial application and program fee)	\$2,000
(f)	Masters Degree Granting Institutions (in addition to base initial application and program fee)	\$3,000
(g)	Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions (in addition to base initial application and program fee)	\$4,000
(h)	Authority to Grant Degrees – Unaccredited Institutions (in addition to base initial application, program and degree level fees)	\$1,000
(i)	New Programs – Authorized Institutions	\$500
(j)	Degree Level Elevation – Authorized Institutions	\$1,000
(k)	Agent Fee In-State – Initial Application	\$500
(l)	Agent Fee In-State – Renewal Application	\$250
(m)	Agent Fee Out-of-State– Initial Application	\$600
(n)	Agent Fee Out-of-State– Renewal Application	\$300
(o)	Institutional Name Change	\$500
(p)	Change of Address	\$500
(q)	Non-compliance Fines (per day, per violation)	\$500

(4) Reauthorization fees for in-state institutions are based upon an institution's annual gross tuition revenue collected during the previous fiscal year (July 1 to June 30). Reauthorization fees for out-of-state institutions are based on an institution's annual gross tuition revenue collected from Tennessee students during the previous fiscal year (July 1 to June 30). In each instance the reauthorization fee shall equal point seventy-five percent (.75%) of the annual gross tuition collected with a minimum fee of five hundred dollars (\$500) and maximum fee of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000).

Authority: T.C.A. §§49-7-2005, 49-7-2014 and 49-7-2017.

\* If a roll-call vote was necessary, the vote by the Agency on these rulemaking hearing rules was as follows:

Board Member	Aye	No	Abstain	Absent	Signature (if required)
Ms. Katie Winchester	X				
Mr. Jack Murrah	X				
Mr. AC Wharton, Jr.	X				
Mr. Tre Hargett	X				
Mr. Justin P. Wilson				X	
Mr. David H. Lillard, Jr.				X	
Mr. Robert White	X				
Mr. Charles Mann	X				
Ms. Sue Atkinson				X	
Mr. Gregory P. Isaacs				X	
Ms. Carolyn Morrison				X	
Mr. Cato Johnson	X				
Mr. David C. Holt	x				

I certify that this is an accurate and complete copy of rulemaking hearing rules, lawfully promulgated and adopted by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission on 05/23/2009, and is in compliance with the provisions of TCA 4-5-222.

I further certify the following:

Notice of Rulemaking Hearing filed with the Department of State on: 01/21/2009

Notice published in the Tennessee Administrative Register on: 02/13/2009

Rulemaking Hearing(s) Conducted on: (add more dates). 03/19/2009

Date: 05/11/2009

Signature: *Richard G. Rhoda*

Name of Officer: Dr. Richard G. Rhoda

Title of Officer: Executive Director



Subscribed and sworn to before me on: 05-11-09

Notary Public Signature: *Corsina Dickson-Wiley*

My commission expires on: 09-03-2012

All rulemaking hearing rules provided for herein have been examined by the Attorney General and Reporter of the State of Tennessee and are approved as to legality pursuant to the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act, Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 4, Chapter 5.

*Robert E. Cooper, Jr.*  
Robert E. Cooper, Jr.  
Attorney General and Reporter

5-13-09  
Date

Department of State Use Only

Filed with the Department of State on: \_\_\_\_\_

Effective on: \_\_\_\_\_

5/14/09

7/28/09

*Tre Hargett*

Tre Hargett  
Secretary of State

RECEIVED

2009 MAY 14 AM 10:59

SECRETARY OF STATE  
PUBLICATIONS

## Public Hearing Comments

One copy of a document containing responses to comments made at the public hearing must accompany the filing pursuant to T.C.A. §4-5-222. Agencies shall include only their responses to public hearing comments, which can be summarized. No letters of inquiry from parties questioning the rule will be accepted. When no comments are received at the public hearing, the agency need only draft a memorandum stating such and include it with the Rulemaking Hearing Rule filing. Minutes of the meeting will not be accepted. Transcripts are not acceptable.

Nature of Comment	THEC Response
The amount of the proposed fee increase is too great and unreasonable.	THEC has statutory authority "to set fees annually based on the intent to collect revenues sufficient to cover the costs of this regulatory function (including, but not limited to travel, employee costs, legal costs, expert fees)." T.C.A. §49-7-2014. Through this rulemaking, THEC is seeking to recover its current operating expenses. Currently, THEC is relying on reserves to fund the budget of DPSA. It is expected that those reserves will be depleted during FY09-10. The proposed fee increases are necessary in order to fully fund the operating budget in the coming years. Using data from FY07-08, it is reasonable to conclude that the modified fee structure will result in revenues that will cover all anticipated costs even in the event that institutions close or tuition collections decrease. Specifically, the FY09-10 budget for THEC is one point six (1.6) million dollars. It is anticipated that the modified proposed fee for annual reauthorization will result in revenues totaling at least one point forty-five (1.45) million dollars and that revenues from other fees will cover the remaining costs.
THEC should consider alternatives. Suggested alternatives were the adoption of a cap, a phased-in approach, a flat .75% fee, and fee for service.	Given that during any year schools open and close, new programs are offered, and enrollment fluctuates, it is not possible to determine with 100% certainty the amount of fees that THEC will collect in a given fiscal year. Despite this impediment, prior to issuing the Notice of Rulemaking Hearing, THEC considered many alternatives and chose the fee structure set forth in the notice, because it provides the greatest degree of certainty that THEC will be able to fully collect the costs associated with its regulatory function. After reviewing the written and oral comments with regard to alternative proposals, THEC has modified the fee structure, but remains sufficiently satisfied that the estimated revenues from the modified fee structure will generate sufficient revenues to cover the current operating budget of DPSA.
The five (5) additional staff members added to the Division of Postsecondary School Authorization are not needed for diligent and effective regulation.	The question of whether THEC requires additional staff to effectively perform its statutorily mandated duties has already been addressed by the legislature. Specifically, the argument in this proceeding was previously presented to the Joint Legislative Study Committee on Proprietary Schools and Career Colleges and rejected. During meetings of the joint committee, members discussed the need for THEC to regulate proprietary schools more aggressively and the need for additional regulatory staff. Later, the General Assembly passed 2008 Tenn. Pub. Ch. 1203, §10, Item 38. This bill provided funding of four hundred and thirty thousand dollars (\$430,000) for the addition of five (5) full-time positions. Pursuant to the committee discussions and legislation, THEC added five (5) additional staff members. However, absent the legislative actions, THEC finds that the five (5) additional staff members are necessary to fully implement the requirements of Title 49, Chapter 7, Part 20, T.C.A. §49-7-207, T.C.A. §49-7-144, and the applicable rules.
The timing of the proposed fee increase is inappropriate given the poor economy.	THEC has not raised its fees since 1992. THEC recognizes that the fee increase is substantial and that the timing is not ideal. Currently, however, THEC cannot cover the costs of its regulatory function absent an increase in fees. The total amount of the fee increase is needed at this time to cover anticipated costs.

Nature of Comment	THEC Response
The proposed increase is arbitrary.	<p>The proposed increase is in no way arbitrary. The increase is designed to cover the operating budget of DPSA as is permitted by T.C.A. §49-7-2014. The argument presented by TAICS is that the fee is arbitrary because it does not correlate to increased regulation and enforcement. This is false. The fee increase is necessitated in part by the addition of five (5) staff members. The addition of these staff members has aided THEC in complying with T.C.A. §49-7-2019 (enacted in 2008), which requires that THEC post job placement and graduation information on THEC's website. Additionally, the new staff members have been necessary to better the regulatory function of THEC. Specifically, as a result of having the new staff members, THEC has been able to verify job placement and graduation information by increasing the number of compliance audits conducted by DPSA. Additionally, THEC has been able to more thoroughly scrutinize compliance with regulations during the reauthorization process, to better represent THEC in legal matters, and to more effectively identify and communicate with institutions that are not in compliance with statutes and rules.</p>

Nature of Comment	THEC Response
<p>The proposed fee increase is not comparable to other states.</p>	<p>A comparison of states cannot be fully relied on because the states do not have the same fee structure, degree of oversight, regulatory jurisdiction, or staffing levels. At first blush a comparison of factors, such as initial authorization fees, maximum renewal fees, or calculations of cost per institution, may seem persuasive. However, a more studied review reveals that significant differences among states compromise the validity of any comparative results. Examples of important differences include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In some states two (2) organizations do the work of DPSA. Such states include Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, North Carolina, Ohio and Texas. The significance of this difference is magnified when both state agencies are not used for comparative purposes. For example, some have referenced the five hundred and seventy thousand dollar (\$570,000) FY08-09 budget of the Ohio State Board of Career Schools and Colleges for the purposes of comparing the one point six (1.6) million dollar FY08-09 budget of DPSA. However, these references fail to mention that in Ohio a group within the Ohio Board of Regents also oversees certain private institutions and the budget for that group is one point eight (1.8) million dollars for FY08-09.</li> <li>• Many states charge fees that are not included in the modified proposed rule. For example, the Georgia Nonpublic Postsecondary Education Commission charges five hundred dollars \$500 for a request for exemption and one hundred dollars (\$100) for a request for renewal of exemption. The Florida Commission for Independent Education can charge between five hundred dollars (\$500) and two thousand dollars (\$2,000) for processing a complaint. The Ohio State Board of Career Colleges and Schools has the authority to charge institutions a maximum of five dollars (\$5) per Ohio student. Some states, including Alabama, Florida and Georgia, charge a specific fee for site visits. Tennessee does not have and is not proposing any such fees.</li> <li>• The bases for the initial and reauthorization fee calculations differ. Although a majority of states use gross tuition collected as the basis for the calculation of fees due, other states factor in the number of students, flat fees, length of programs, types of instructional sites and travel expenses associated with site visits.</li> <li>• Some institutions have compared the number of employees presumably to support the argument that DPSA is overstaffed. It is intuitive that absent waste and inefficiencies more staff permits an agency to better perform its assigned duties. Absent waste and inefficiencies, it is self-evident that three (3) employees cannot do the same work as well as fourteen (14). Tennessee has a robust regulatory scheme and the current staffing levels are needed to fully implement that scheme.</li> <li>• In Alabama, Kentucky, and South Carolina the regulatory agencies receive some level of state funding. In Tennessee, DPSA receives no state funds.</li> </ul> <p>These points highlight the differences between states and demonstrate that the comparisons offered are without the detail sufficient to allow complete reliance.</p>

Nature of Comment	THEC Response
<p>The proposed fee increase along with other factors will result in loss of small schools.</p>	<p>THEC believes that the proposed fee amounts for lower grossing institutions are reasonable despite the amount of the increase. The minimum fee is five hundred dollars (\$500), which represents a one hundred and fifty dollar (\$150) per year increase. Per Rule 1540-1-2-.14(4), institutions must maintain financial resources adequate to meet maintenance and overhead expenses; payroll expenses; books, supplies, and equipment expenses; and general operating costs. Arguably, an institution that is unable to pay five hundred dollars (\$500) each year does not have the financial resources necessary to adequately continue operations. Similarly, as an institution's gross tuition grows, the institution is better situated to cover the additional fee. Also, Rule 1540-1-2-.14(6) permits institutions grossing less than one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) in tuition to request a waiver of the requirement to file audited financial statements. Such a waiver represents a reduction of regulatory costs.</p>
<p>The proposed fee increase creates a precedent for similar increases in the future.</p>	<p>The revenue generated from current fees is insufficient to cover the cost of regulation contemplated by Title 49, Chapter 7, Part 20. THEC has statutory authority (T.C.A. §49-7-2014) "to set fees annually based on the intent to collect revenues sufficient to cover the costs of this regulatory function (including, but not limited to travel, employee costs, legal costs, expert fees)." The proposed rule intends to collect only the costs of the regulatory function, which THEC is statutorily required to do.</p>
<p>The proposed fee increase will cause institutions to reconsider their investment in Tennessee.</p>	<p>The amount of an institution's investment in Tennessee will be determined based on the ability of the institution to generate revenues in a desired proportion to the amount of investment. It is not likely that the imposition of the modified proposed fee would greatly affect a determination with regard to whether to contribute investment dollars to Tennessee. In particular, between the January 2008 and 2009 Committee agendas, NCBT and Walden University, combined, were approved to offer 29 new programs. This continued investment in Tennessee indicates that anticipated revenues are present in Tennessee to cover additional costs.</p>
<p>If fees are to be increased, institutions should see additional or enhanced services.</p>	<p>THEC notes that the regulatory efforts of DPSA have already expanded as a result of the budget increase and expects that those efforts will continue to expand. Over the past year, THEC, through the work of the staff of DPSA, has implemented the requirement of T.C.A. §49-7-2019, which required THEC to post the graduation and placement rates for all institutions on THEC's website. This effort was accompanied by audits of all institutions to verify the data submitted by schools and compliance with certain rule provisions. In the past, DPSA has not been able to conduct such a large-scale effort. DPSA intends to continue these types of audits by auditing approximately one-third (1/3) of all institutions each year and by expanding the scope of the audits. Additionally, DPSA has worked to more strictly enforce the requirements of Title 49, Chapter 7, Part 20 and the related rules. During the reauthorization period, many institutions were surprised by findings that had not been previously recognized. Also, the legal work of DPSA has increased significantly over the past few years. The addition of an attorney to the staff has served to more efficiently handle these matters, including bringing noncompliant institutions into compliance. These are examples of improvements within the Division. It is without questions that students and institutions in Tennessee will benefit from the enhanced DPSA staff.</p>

Nature of Comment	THEC Response
THEC indicated it could absorb the cost of last year's legislation.	During the January 28, 2008 joint study committee discussion, THEC was asked about the need to increase fees in the event that additional staff members were added. In response, Dr. Rhoda stated: "We are totally user fee dependent and we have built up a reserve over the years really for just such an occasion or in the event that there is some change in the whole organization so we could at least for one year; we can get it initiated without increasing the fees – minimally a year." The plain language of Dr. Rhoda's comments is that fees would not be increased for one year. THEC initiated the rulemaking process, which at best is a lengthy process, in January 2009, one year after the joint study committee meeting. The earliest that THEC anticipates the rules becoming effective is August 1, 2009. This means that the fee increase will not occur until more that 19 months after the final joint study committee meeting.
The use of a fiscal year for purposes of reauthorization results in additional accounting and administrative staff costs when the institution operates on a calendar year.	Having reviewed the concern expressed, DPSA will modify the reauthorization application to state that an institution may file the required financial information using the institution's fiscal year.
The Renewal Extension Fee in Paragraph 3(b) is punitive given that the reauthorization fiscal year may not be the same as an institution's fiscal year.	The fee should remain in the rule. There is a need to prevent extension requests based on nothing more than missing a deadline. Moreover, the fact that DPSA will modify the reauthorization application to permit institutions to file the required financial information using the institutions fiscal year should mitigate the concerns of Nashville Auction School, LLC.

### Regulatory Flexibility Addendum

Pursuant to Public Chapter 464 of the 105<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, prior to initiating the rule making process as described in § 4-5-202(a)(3) and § 4-5-202(a), all agencies shall conduct a review of whether a proposed rule or rule affects small businesses.

(1) The type or types of small business and an identification and estimate of the number of small businesses subject to the proposed rule that would bear the cost of, or directly benefit from the proposed rule: The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) represents that the only type of business affected by this rule revision is non-exempt postsecondary educational institutions. Pursuant to this rule revision, all non-exempt postsecondary educational institutions regardless of the number of full-time employees employed will bear the cost of the fee increase proposed in this rule.

(2) The projected reporting, recordkeeping and other administrative costs required for compliance with the proposed rule, including the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record: THEC represents that the projected reporting, recordkeeping and other administrative costs required for compliance with the proposed rule are minimal as institutions currently maintain all information needed to calculate the fees. Similarly, no professional skills are necessary as only basic math skills are needed to calculate the total amount of any fees due.

(3) A statement of the probable effect on impacted small businesses and consumers: THEC represents that the rule will increase the reauthorization fee of all non-exempt postsecondary educational institutions. The amount of the increase will depend on the gross tuition collected by the institution. Other fee increases applicable to all currently authorized non-exempt postsecondary educational institutions, including those that qualify as small businesses, are:

Action Item	Current Fees	New Fees
Late Renewal Fee (in addition to base renewal fee)	\$500	\$1,000
Renewal Extension Fee (in addition to base renewal fee)	\$0	\$500
New Programs – Authorized Institutions	\$300	\$500
Degree Level Elevation – Authorized Institutions	\$0	\$1,000
Agent Fee In-State – Initial Application	\$100	\$500
Agent Fee In-State – Renewal Application	\$100	\$250
Agent Fee Out-of-State– Initial Application	\$200	\$600
Agent Fee Out-of-State– Renewal Application	\$200	\$300
Institutional Name Change	\$300	\$500
Change of Address	\$300	\$500
Non-compliance Fines (per day, per violation)	\$500	\$500

If a currently authorized postsecondary educational institution decides to open a new instructional site or an entity decides to seek authorization, the following fee schedule would apply:

Action Item	Current Fees	New Fees
Initial New School Application	\$2,500	\$3,000
Each Proposed Program	\$300	\$500
Associate Degree Granting Institutions (in addition to base initial application and program fee)	\$0	\$1,000
Bachelor Degree Granting Institutions (in addition to base initial application and program fee)	\$0	\$2,000
Masters Degree Granting Institutions (in addition to base initial application and program fee)	\$0	\$3,000
Doctoral Degree Granting Institutions (in addition to base initial application and program fee)	\$0	\$4,000
Authority to Grant Degrees – Unaccredited Institutions (in addition to base initial application, program and degree level fees)	\$1000	\$1,000

(4) A description of any less burdensome, less intrusive or less costly alternative methods of achieving the purpose and objectives of the proposed rule that may exist, and to what extent the alternative means might be less burdensome to small business: The purpose of the rulemaking is to set fees through which THEC will receive revenues sufficient to cover the costs of the regulatory function described in Title 49, Chapter 7, Part 20. Tennessee Code Annotated section 49-7-2014(a) explicitly authorizes THEC to set fees for this purpose. THEC considered numerous alternatives to the fee structure adopted. Alternatives considered included a phased-in approach, application of a cap, a flat point seventy-five percent (.75%), and a fee for service approach. In particular, the flat point seventy-five percent (.75%) alternative was proposed as a small school friendly approach whereas the application of a cap was proposed as a fair alternative for schools that have large tuition collections. In response, THEC considered the arguments of all institutions and adopted a blended approach. The adopted fee structure lists flat fees for particular services and, for annual reauthorization, applies a set percentage rate of point seventy-five percent (.75%) to gross tuitions collected subject to a minimum fee of five hundred dollars (\$500) and maximum fee of twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000).

(5) A comparison of the proposed rule with any federal or state counterparts: THEC represents that there are no federal or state counterparts to the rule at issue.

(6) Analysis of the effect of the possible exemption of small businesses from all or any part of the requirements contained in the proposed rule: THEC represents that the exemption of small businesses from the application of the rule would likely result in THEC not recovering revenues sufficient to cover the cost of the regulatory function as described in Title 49, Chapter 7, Part 20. Therefore, THEC would be required to adjust the fee structure to increase the funding burden of non-exempt postsecondary educational institutions that do not meet the definition of small business.

## Additional Information Required by Joint Government Operations Committee

All agencies, upon filing a rule, must also submit the following pursuant to TCA 4-5-226(i)(1).

- (A) A brief summary of the rule and a description of all relevant changes in previous regulations effectuated by such rule;

The rule at issue, 1540-01-02-.25, lists the fees to be paid by non-exempt postsecondary educational institutions. On May 22, 1992, Public Chapter 1026 went into effect granting authority to THEC to set fees annually in order to collect revenues sufficient to cover the costs of regulation. Thereafter, THEC initiated a rulemaking proceeding and a rule setting forth fees went into effect on September 28, 1992. Since 1992, the annual reauthorization fee calculated from an institution's gross tuition collected has remained the same. The only fee changes since 1992 are as follows: (1) the change of ownership fee of five hundred dollars (\$500) was deleted effective October 1998; (2) the one thousand and six hundred dollar (\$1,600) fee for the annual renewal application for out-of-state institutions recruiting Tennessee students was deleted effective August 2008; and (3) the change of name fee of three hundred dollars (\$300) was added effective August 2008.

- (B) A citation to and brief description of any federal law or regulation or any state law or regulation mandating promulgation of such rule or establishing guidelines relevant thereto;

T.C.A. §49-7-2014(a) provides that the "commission is authorized to set fees annually based on the intent to collect revenues sufficient to cover the costs of this regulatory function (including, but not limited to travel, employee costs, legal costs, expert fees)." Further, paragraph (c) provides: "The fees to be collected by the commission shall accompany an application for authorization to operate an institution or an application for an agent's permit, or other application or request in accordance with the schedule set out in the administrative rules under this chapter. All fees shall be stated as a flat fee, with the exception of renewal fees, which shall be based upon an institution's annual gross tuition revenues."

- (C) Identification of persons, organizations, corporations or governmental entities most directly affected by this rule, and whether those persons, organizations, corporations or governmental entities urge adoption or rejection of this rule;

All non-exempt postsecondary educational institutions are directly affected by this rule. During the rulemaking process, twelve (12) institutions of the one hundred and sixty-six (166) institutions with authorization (approximately seven percent (7%)) and two (2) associations offered comments on the rules. Generally, the comments recognized a need to increase fees. Comments in opposition to the rule focused on the amount of the increase and the fee structure. THEC has provided detailed responses to all public comments.

- (D) Identification of any opinions of the attorney general and reporter or any judicial ruling that directly relates to the rule;

THEC represents that there are no opinions of the attorney general and reporter or any judicial ruling that directly relate to the rule.

- (E) An estimate of the probable increase or decrease in state and local government revenues and expenditures, if any, resulting from the promulgation of this rule, and assumptions and reasoning upon which the estimate is based. An agency shall not state that the fiscal impact is minimal if the fiscal impact is more than two percent (2%) of the agency's annual budget or five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000), whichever is less;

THEC represents that there will be no increase or decrease in state or local government revenues, but that the application of the rule will result in additional fee revenue of approximately nine hundred thousand dollars (\$900,000). THEC estimates earnings from fees during the FY08-09 fiscal year to be approximately seven hundred thousand dollars (\$700,000). THEC will use reserve monies to fully fund the cost of regulation incurred during the FY08-09 fiscal year. However, THEC cannot rely on the reserve for fiscal year FY09-10, because the amounts remaining in the reserve will not be sufficient to cover the cost of regulation and the reserve will be depleted. Therefore, THEC represents that the additional fee revenue is necessary.

- (F)** Identification of the appropriate agency representative or representatives, possessing substantial knowledge and understanding of the rule;

Will Burns, Associate Executive Director, Legal and Regulatory Affairs  
Dr. Stephanie Bellard Chase, Assistant Executive Director, Division of Postsecondary School Authorization  
Julie Woodruff, Director Regulatory Affairs, Division of Postsecondary School Authorization

- (G)** Identification of the appropriate agency representative or representatives who will explain the rule at a scheduled meeting of the committees;

Will Burns, Associate Executive Director, Legal and Regulatory Affairs  
Dr. Stephanie Bellard Chase, Assistant Executive Director, Division of Postsecondary School Authorization  
Julie Woodruff, Director Regulatory Affairs, Division of Postsecondary School Authorization

- (H)** Office address and telephone number of the agency representative or representatives who will explain the rule at a scheduled meeting of the committees; and

Will Burns, Associate Executive Director, Legal and Regulatory Affairs  
(615)741-7571  
Dr. Stephanie Bellard Chase, Assistant Executive Director, Division of Postsecondary School Authorization  
(615)532-7495  
Julie Woodruff, Director Regulatory Affairs, Division of Postsecondary School Authorization  
(615)253-8857  
All persons located at:  
Tennessee Higher Education Commission  
Parkway Towers, Suite 1900  
404 James Robertson Parkway  
Nashville, TN 37243-0830

- (I)** Any additional information relevant to the rule proposed for continuation that the committee requests.

Additional information available upon request.