

2019-2020 Tuition Review Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, September 26, 2019

12:00 pm – 1:30 pm

Winslow Hall Conference Room

Attendees: Margery Overton, Interim Senior Vice Provost for Office of Institutional Research and Planning (non-voting); Peter Harries, Dean of the Graduate School; Mitchell Moravec, Student Senate President; Krista Ringer, Associate Vice Provost and Director Scholarships and Financial Aid; Mark Hoversten (subbing for David Hinks), Dean of the College of Design; James Withrow, Graduate Student Association President; Hans Kellner, Chair of the Faculty; Mary Peloquin-Dodd, Interim Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration; Kelly Wick, Director of Special Projects and Planning for the Provost (non-voting), Warwick Arden, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost; Emma Carter, Student Body President; Duane Larick, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Strategy and Resource Management and Chief of Staff (non-voting); Lisa Zapata, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs; Lu Liu, Professor and Department Head of Graphic Design & Industrial Design and Chair of the Department Head Advisory Board; Amanda Sullivan, Senior Budget Analyst in the Office of the Provost; Barbara Moses, Associate Vice Chancellor for Budget and Resource Management (non-voting); Jennifer Coltrane, Assistant Director, Systems Data & Reporting (non-voting); Luke McHale, Assistant Director, Budget Office (non-voting); Rhonda Raynor, Accountant in Budget Office (non-voting); Katharine Stewart, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs (observer).

1. Introductions and review of committee charge
 - a. Introductions were made by name and what area each person was representing.
 - b. The Provost reminded everyone that they are representing a group of people at this meeting and their charge was to communicate back to those groups.

2. Discussion of historical Campus Initiated Tuition Increase (CITI) tuition and premium
 - a. Provost gave an explanation of requirement vs. tuition and appropriation.
 - b. Explained the difference between campus tuition increase and legislative tuition increase. Legislative increase does not increase the requirement. It is more money that the state is charging to the student and their parents and less that they are appropriating. The university does not get this money.
 - c. Campus initiated tuition increase will increase the total requirement. The increase in recurring tuition revenue is a permanent increase to the university.
 - d. Premium tuition is considered a form of CITI. Instead of being a category of students, it's only for students in a particular program such as the master of analytics. Unlike the resources that come from CITI, they go directly back to that program. The University or the college do not take any of that centrally. We do not have premium tuition requests this year.
 - e. This committee does not determine fees as that is through a separate committee co-chaired by the Vice Chancellor for DASA and Student Senate President.

- f. Our recommendations along with the fee committee's recommendations will go to the Chancellor. He has the authority to change anything that is presented. Then the combined tuition and fees will go to the November BOT meeting. Then will go to the system office. BOG will look at proposals in January and then vote in March. Final authority rests with BOG. Does not go downtown and the legislature does not become part of the budget process. It will be implemented in the fall 2020-21.
 - g. Want to be mindful of raising tuition too quickly but also be aware that we are on the low side.
 - h. A couple of other things to be aware of.
 - i. Four or five years ago, the legislature put into effect through law, tuition for incoming in-state undergraduate students must remain flat for the 4 years they are in school.
 - ii. In addition to that the BOG has given us directives each year for the last 2 or 3 years that there should be 0% in state increase to undergrad students. When we look at the other 3 categories of students meaning out of state undergrad and resident and nonresident graduation should be market driven. We are still in the lower quartile of our peers.
3. Review of 2018-2019 request and other communications received from the System Office
- a. Reviewed previous tuition increases over the last 4 years.
 - b. Increases are distributed to four categories: need based financial aid, improve quality and accessibility, GSSP, and Faculty Salary increases.
 - c. If we overestimate a category, such as the amount we need for promotional increases, we take that money automatically and put it into quality and accessibility i.e. student centered programs.
 - d. Did receive instructions from the System Office. Can go up to 3% for in-state undergrad now. Timeline wise, there have been years we didn't get this letter until after the process was completed.
 - e. Question on GSSP expenditure went down extensively, do we know why. Duane - yes was a hold harmless. Reflects graduate estimated GSSP. It's directly related to the increase to graduate student tuition.
4. NC State Student Body perspective [E. Carter] 5 – 10 mins
- a. Students always are going to want tuition to be low and will always consider tuition when going to school. What am I getting for what I am paying? It is important to stay competitive for peer institutions. A majority of undergrad are residents. Grads are important, and I want to retain them for research and teaching.
 - b. James - only thing to add because of holding the GSSP harmless, increasing on the grad students is less effective way of doing that. What we raise just goes back into GSSP. It does that less well than in other areas. Provost - the amount you have to put back increases the gap between in state and out of state. It creates tuition remission. Another history is not to increase the gap too much.

Peter - one other thing to consider is that out of state under grad is more expensive than in state grad, does this decrease the perceived value of the graduate degree?

- c. Emma - we will stay in connection with students. Will put a report that goes into the howl and paw print and talking about this on social media. Of course I will talk with the student government, what do they feel and the different perspectives on that.

5. Review of Graduate Student Data & Graduate Student Support Plan Projections

- a. Peter gave his presentation and it will be shared with the committee as well as on the TRAC website.
- b. Questions:
- c. Provost - a couple of important points to mention. We're a little unique as a university, that in many states, if you are on a qualifying assistantship, graduate fees are just waived. We don't have the ability to wave them. It is the complex relationship between tuition and requirement.

6. Review of Financial Aid data & Financial Aid projections for 2020-21 and 2021-22

- a. Purpose to share the landscape of what need based financial aid looks like on our campus. Will look at some trend data.
- b. Question asked how the money goes down: there can be formula changes to big programs.

Next Meeting:

Friday, October 4: 1:00 pm – 2:00 pm, Chancellor's Conference Room