

**2021-2022 Tuition Review Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes**

Friday, September 24, 2021

8:00 am – 9:30 am

1. Introductions, review of committee charge, instructions from system office [Warwick Arden, McKenzy Heavlin]
 - a. Introductions were made.
 - b. Provost gave opening remarks. Discussed different kinds of increase. When the legislature puts through a legislative increase, it is at the expense of appropriation. It does not expand our requirement and it doesn't result in additional resources coming to the university. When we do a campus initiated increase, that is not at the expense of appropriation it is additional recurring revenue to the university and expands our requirement.
 - c. There have been a lot of restrictions over CITI over the last several years.
 - d. Shared brief slides prepared by Barbara Moses. Basically for resident no increase but for non-resident we can. Also reviewed the fee instructions since tuition and fees go up together. Mandatory fees – any proposed increase must offset by a commensurate decrease to another fee. New fees only allowed for new programs and increases allowed with increase in pass through charges.
 - e. The Provost also mentioned premium tuition. This is a tuition surcharge if you will. All the money is returned to that program. Falls under the same guidelines, so we could only apply to out of state. This does limit us because we never in our history have applied premium to only out of state students. They're meant to benefit directly everyone in the program. So like last year we may not be able to pursue premiums as the BOG level. The Chancellor has asked us to still go ahead and consider premiums and have approval at our own BOT level and then go from there.

2. Discussion of historical Campus Initiated Tuition Increase including (CITI), tuition premium and peer review [W. Arden]
 - a. Discussed peer comparisons on tuition. For in-state undergrad we are second lowest of all our peers, a place we have stayed for many years.
 - b. The directions used to be that we remain in the lowest quartile. Then a state law was enacted for level tuition. So when we talk increase for in-state undergrads, we would only talk about new incoming students.
 - c. For the remaining categories: in-state grad, out of state undergrad and out of state grad we are all third from the lowest.
 - d. The Provost reviewed the historical increase document of four years. If you go back you will see that we had no increases for in state undergraduates for at least four years. Before that, increases were only for new undergraduate students. If you look some of the other categories, in 2018 – 19, undergrad out of state up 4%, grad in state up 5% and grad out of state 6%.
 - e. There was a time between 2011-12 and 18-19 when CITI was yielding between 8 – 12 million per year. As you can see in the last few years, that has tapered off. As a reminder, of the new resources that my office gets to underpin student success and provide academic support for the student body. I only have two sources of revenue, CITI and enrollment increase.

- f. The Provost discussed the four categories of expenditures of CITI. They are need based financial aid, improve quality and accessibility (seats, sections, instructors, advisors, and support across student body in a number of ways), hold harmless the GSSP and last towards faculty salaries which is usually only promotional increases. When faculty are promoted, from assistant to associate then get a 6% increase and from associate to full an 8% increase. Faculty increase cost different amounts, depending on how many people going up for promotion.
 - g. For need based financial aid. We are still under a mandatory cap from the BOG that we are not allowed to put more than 15% of tuition receipts into financial aid. We try to put enough in to hold harmless or almost hold harmless need based financial aid. In the last few years, we have not put in enough to hold harmless.
 - h. GSSP – depending on source of funding, covers in state and out of state tuition, health benefits. When we increase graduate tuition, it increases the cost to the GSSP. Just like financial aid, we try to hold that harmless as well. That fund ends up always in the red which we bail out from my office.
 - i. The last category is mentioned is faculty promotion which I covered earlier.
 - j. Anything leftover goes to improve quality and accessibility. I do always want to make sure there is some amount going to this expenditure. This is really the only money supporting general student body. At the end of the year, if it turns out we haven't used all the resources such as faculty promotion, we will roll the excess into quality and accessibility as well. You can see from the current year, that's less than 1 million which is not a lot of money.
 - k. Two comments before turning over to McKenzy. One, is having student representation on the committee is very important to us. That is why we have the student reps that we have. We take your input very seriously and McKenzy is the co-chair. That is the avenue for the student input. I know recently the student senate has wanted to have input as well. I don't want people to misunderstand that student senate has a role in determining tuition increases because they don't. McKenzy, Brianna, Dev and Molly are the voice of the students through this in this committee. Second, in my time here, this has been a very collegial process. I'm not a high tuition guy but have come to realize the university does need some additional resources each year to continue to provide more resources.
3. NC State Student Body perspective [M. Heavlin]
- a. McKenzy thanked everyone for serving on the committee. Also thanked for having the students on the committee that we do have. Will be brief. Students generally don't want tuition increases. I know for undergrad and grad instate was very to see no increases from BOG level because I think that supports our mission as a land grant to be affordable to NC residents. As we look at tuition for out of state students, making sure we're remaining low and competitive is key. Excited to see what percentages this committee will come up with, especially in regards to the four expenditure categories. The need based financial aid and GSSP are the two areas up for consideration in my mind as well. The faculty salaries are also important due to the impact faculty have on students and keeping them here. Maintaining affordability for out of state students as we're considering increase is important. I'll be presenting a lot of this information to the students and continue to get their feedback. Student reps will be sure to get the feedback to this group as we look at numbers and decision making.
4. Review of Graduate Student Data & Graduate Student Support Plan Projections [Peter Harries]
- a. Peter Harries gave a presentation on GSSP which was shared with the committee and posted on the TRAC website.

5. Review of Financial Aid data & Financial Aid projections for 2022-23 [Krista Ringler]
 - a. Krista Ringler gave a presentation on Financial Aid which was shared with the committee and posted on the TRAC website.
6. Closing remarks. Thank you everyone and we will see you next Friday.