

Background





CHE and BPE

CHE: Indiana Commission for Higher Education, est. 1971

BPE: Indiana Board for Proprietary Education, est. 2012

- CHE:
 - Staffs BPE
 - Leads BPE
 - Administers BPE funds (Credit-Bearing and Student Assurance)



BPE Overview

- Authorized for-profit and selected non-profit institutions that are:
 - Credit-bearing
 - Degree-granting
 - Accredited by a body recognized by the U.S.
 Department of Education or seeking such accreditation



Credit-Bearing, Degree-Granting, Accredited Institution

Three State
Agency
Responsibilities

	Yes				
	Indiana Institution	Out-of-State	All Institutions		
		Physical Presence	Distance Education		
Public	CHE	BPE	CHE	DWD	
Private Not-for- Profit	CHE	BPE	CHE	DWD	
Private For-Profit (Proprietary)	BPE	BPE	CHE	DWD	



Membership and Meetings

- Board consists of:
 - 5 gubernatorial appointees
 - 2 ex-officio members (CHE and IDOE)
- Board meets quarterly to consider institutional and degree authorization

Institutions by Control



Indiana Private, For-Profit	14
Indiana Private, Non-Profit	4
Out-of-State Private, For-Profit	7
Out-of-State Private, Non-Profit	6
Total	31

Phase 1: Methodology





Problem

 Lack of adequate, available metrics to determine institutional financial health

- Federal Financial Responsibility Composite Score (FRCS):
 - Has weaknesses
 - Lacks transparency
 - Is usually out of date



Composite Score (FRCS)

• The scale ranges from 3.0 to negative 1.0:

- 1.5 or greater the institution is financially responsible.
- Less than 1.5 but 1.0 or higher financially responsible.*
- Less than 1.0 the institution is not financially responsible.*

*The U.S. DOE requires additional monitoring (e.g. posting a letter of credit).



Composite Score Availability

- U.S. DOE:
 - Calculates a composite score for all institutions participating in Title IV
 - Doesn't calculate one for non-participating institutions

 BPE requires non-participating institutions to provide a <u>comparable</u> <u>score</u> calculated by an independent auditor using U.S. DOE methodology



Solution

 BPE contracted with Plante Moran to analyze audited financial statements for selected BPE institutions

 Plante Moran developed a methodology and metrics for assessing the financial health of institutions

Phase 2: Sustainability





Help Needed & How To Pay for It

- Help needed scenarios:
 - Scan of all BPE authorized institutions
 - Developing a "watch list"
 - In-depth financial analysis of selected institutions

- Revenue sources:
 - Institutional authorization (initial and renewal)
 - Program authorization (initial and renewal)



Rate

Current Fees: Initial Authorization

Initial Authorization

Institutions with a Physical Presence	
One-Time	\$ 2,500
Per Initital New Degree	\$ 300
Per Certificate, Per Diploma	\$ 25
Institutions with No Dhysical Drosonos	
Institutions with No Physical Presence	
One-Time	\$ 2,500
Variable, Per New Program	\$ 25



Rate

Current Fees: Authorization Renewal

Renewal of Authorization (Annual)

Institutions with a Physical Presence Baseline, per Institution Variable, per Number of Programs	\$ 1,000 \$ 25
Institutions with No Physical Presence	
Baseline, per Institution	\$ 1,000
Variable, per Number of Programs	\$ 25

Phase 3: Watch List





Primary Reserve Ratio (Liquidity)

(adopted from Plante Moran)

- Ratio of:
 - Adjusted Equity to
 - Adjusted Expenses

- Indicator of Ability to:
 - Satisfy current liabilities and manage short-term shocks
 - Pay suppliers in a given number of days
 - Undertake short-term borrowing



Equity Ratio (Leverage)

(adopted from Plante Moran)

- Ratio of:
 - Modified Equity to
 - Modified Total Assets

- Indicator of Ability to:
 - Absorb substantial losses, short- or long-term
 - Raise cash for capital expenditures and/or growth
 - Cover fixed charges



Net Income Ratio (Profitability)

(adopted from Plante Moran)

- Ratio of:
 - Pre-Tax Income to
 - Revenue

- Indicator of Ability:
 - For a for-profit organization to turn a profit
 - To generate cash flow

Composite Score Frimary Net Net			Ratios are calculated after "strength factor"				×	Off "Watch List"		
Institution Type (\$000's) Reserve Ratio Equity Ratio Income Ratio Weighted Total Prior Year-to-Year Variance Watch Ist Proprietary 1 335,336 3.00 2.90 3.00 3.00 1.50 1.50 ★ Proprietary 2 164,948 0.79 2.29 3.00 2.05 1.60 0.45 ★ Non-Profit 61,879 2.52 3.00 3.00 2.39 1.50 0.89 ★			Composite Score				✓	Remain on	"Watch List"	
Type Revenues Ratio Ratio Ratio Total Year Variance Trend List Proprietary 1 335,336 3.00 2.90 3.00 1.50 1.50 ★ Proprietary 2 164,948 0.79 2.29 3.00 2.05 1.60 0.45 ★ Non-Profit 61,879 2.52 3.00 3.00 2.39 1.50 0.89 ★		(Size)	Primary		Net					
Proprietary 1 335,336 3.00 2.90 3.00 1.50 1.50 * Proprietary 2 164,948 0.79 2.29 3.00 2.05 1.60 0.45 * Non-Profit 61,879 2.52 3.00 3.00 2.39 1.50 0.89 *	Institution	(\$000's)	Reserve	Equity	Income	Weighted	Prior	Year-to-Year		Watch
Proprietary 2 164,948 0.79 2.29 3.00 2.05 1.60 0.45 A Non-Profit 61,879 2.52 3.00 3.00 2.39 1.50 0.89 A	<u>Type</u>	Revenues	Ratio	Ratio	Ratio	<u>Total</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Variance</u>	Trend	<u>List</u>
Non-Profit 61,879 2.52 3.00 3.00 2.39 1.50 0.89 🔺 🗶	Proprietary 1	335,336	3.00	2.90	3.00	3.00	1.50	1.50		×
11011 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Proprietary 2	164,948	0.79	2.29	3.00	2.05	1.60	0.45		
	Non-Profit	61,879	2.52	3.00	3.00	2.39	1.50	0.89		×
Proprietary 3 2,100 0.35 3.00 1.78 1.80 2.10 (0.30) ?	Proprietary 3	2,100	0.35	3.00	1.78	1.80	2.10	(0.30)	V	?
Proprietary 4 1,590 3.00 3.00 (1.00) 1.80 1.80 - ?	Proprietary 4	1,590	3.00	3.00	(1.00)	1.80	1.80	-	>	?

Phase 4: In-Depth Review





Agenda for Discussion with Institution One

- Detailed financial statements:
 - Including 90/10 forms
 - Consolidated profit/loss tables
- Investor backing
- Composite score calculation
- Enrollment: past trends, current, future projections



Take-Aways from In-Depth Discussion

- Continued weak financial condition, especially with respect to liquidity, due to:
 - Weak post-pandemic recovery (enrollment losses moving back to in-person from online)
 - Increased instructor salaries, especially for nursing faculty



Additional Take-Aways

Continued concerns about:

- Turnover of campus management, deans of nursing, and other staff, e.g. admissions/recruiters
- Possibility of additional requirements from U.S. DOE for a letter of credit



Positive Take-Aways

- Program portfolio addresses in-demand occupations:
 - Health-care related programs, including nursing
 - HVAC

No campuses in immediate danger of closing



Conclusions about Institution One

Keep on Watch List

- Monitor enrollment trends
- Review institution's nursing programs
- Have 2nd in-depth review in six months or sooner, if U.S.
 DOE imposes additional letter of credit requirements

Conclusions





Overall Conclusions

Very positive about the initiative:

- More reliable information each institution's finances
- More confident because of an expert's 3rd party's analysis
- Better sense of which institutions need to be monitored



Areas of Improvement

Before in-depth discussions:

- Do more discovery in advance (we better know what questions to ask)
- Do more preparation in shaping the agenda

Rationale for Continuing Plante Moran Contract

Expertise:

- Specialized financial knowledge
- Experience dealing with institutions BPE authorizes

Efficient use of resources

Third-party, independent point of view



