

2021-2022 Tuition Review Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes

Friday, October 1, 2021
2:30 pm – 4:00 pm

- I. Approval of minutes from previous meeting
 - a. Motion made for approval of minutes by Peter Harries. Seconded by McKenzy Heavlin. Minutes were approved as submitted unanimously.

- II. Previous meeting recap and review of today's meeting
 - a. Last meeting covered the big picture of tuition increase and how they interface with state appropriation. We covered the process and timeframe. Peter gave a presentation on GSSP and Krista on financial aid.
 - b. Today we're going to consider some brief presentations on two premium tuition requests and two enhancement fee requests. We will discuss restrictions later. We will then let the presenters go and the committee will discuss those requests. Then we'll start some testing of differential rates on tuition in both out of state undergraduate and graduate tuition.

- III. Premium Tuition Requests
 - a. Master in Microbial Biotechnology (MMB)
 - i. Meaghan Nappo spoke and gave the background of the MMB program and benefits the Premium Tuition would have on the program. All detailed materials were provided to the committee and posted on the committee site.
 - ii. Questions
 1. Is the 2,000 per semester or per year?
 - a. Per year.
 2. Question about scholarships, seems like you're raising the tuition \$2,000 and then giving a \$3,000 scholarship so in essence it's \$1,000 scholarship.
 - a. Talked about the amount we allocated for marketing could be moved over to scholarships, but this is a good point.
 3. Clarification to the group that this is a prorated amount.
 - iii. Comments:
 1. There seems to be a need for this program.
 2. Our students starting salaries, if they only earn their MMB is about \$69,000 starting and then their MMB and their MBA that bumps up to about 79,000 so our students are employed, and they are paid well upon graduation.
 - b. DVM
 - i. Laura Nelson spoke and gave the background of the DVM program and benefits the Premium Tuition would have on the program. All detailed materials were provided to the committee and posted on the committee site.
 - ii. There were no questions or comments from the committee.

- IV. Enhancement Fee
 - a. CALS

- i. Rich Linton spoke and gave a presentation on the benefits of the CALS enhancement fee. All detailed materials were provided to the committee and posted on the committee site.
- ii. Question raised on the objection from the program directors.
 - 1. One was student affordability issue and then the graduate cost would come from the PI.
- iii. Follow up was that in engineering the fee was not applied to doctoral students, have you given thought to that?
 - 1. We debated whether to include grad or not. The use of facilities we could figure it out but would be harder because the grad and undergrad are using the same facilities.
- iv. What was the student involvement, invitation to everyone at the college? How are the students engaged and how many engaged?
 - 1. Invited all representatives from our student clubs that are affiliated with the four programs, and we also invited all honors students that were affiliated with the four programs and we kind of had a tight deadline. We didn't have as much of a response as we wanted, we had overall five students that we had pretty in depth, you know, an hour long conversation with them, so it was a kind of rich and qualitative not so strong and quantitative.

b. PCOM

- i. Frank Buckless spoke and gave a presentation on the benefits of the PCOM enhancement fee. All detailed materials were provided to the committee and posted on the committee site.
- ii. Frank introduced a few people, 2 students: Grace Marshall and Zack Abramczyk who were part of the student leadership group that we presented this proposal to get some great feedback and actually changed our proposal based on that feedback.
- iii. Also have Vikaas, ADAA and Maggie Merry, Asst. Dean for Finance and Admin as well as Richard Warr, Associate Dean for Faculty and Research.
- iv. There were no questions or comments from the committee.

V. Big Picture Observations and Comments on Premium Tuition and Enhancement Fee

- a. There are some differences in the way we handle and can use premium tuition and a program enhancement fee.
- b. The commonality is that they both go directly back to the students to benefit the students who are paying them in those programs, we do not at the moment, not that we don't have the authority to, but we do not take a portion at the university level for general institutional support and, in general, colleges do not take a portion for general support unless it is a college wide fee.
- c. The difference, like other tuitions is something that we can't just roll over and from year to year and build up our reserve in, it's reverting like others. It's still considered a state appropriate of receipt. The power of it is that we can use the money very broadly including hiring faculty and staff and so forth, and even paying for the instructional component of faculty. For a lot of programs is one of the major costs of the programs.
- d. On the other side of fee, is a trust fund. So residual amounts that are not expended expended for a year can roll over and be kept, you can build a balance, but you cannot

use fee money for the instructional component of faculty salaries and there are several other restrictions on the use of fee money as well, compared with the tuition money.

- e. You may ask why the tuition review advisory committee is looking at fees and I think it's because when we first did this back on the engineering enhancement fee it was felt that these programs enhancement fees were so much like premium tuitions it was best dealt with through the TRAC process and not through the fee process.
- f. This year like last year there are some limitations on us. Unlike in previous years, it was decided last year and again this year, that limitations on tuition increases, i.e. no increases for in-state undergraduate or graduate tuitions included premium tuitions. The reality is we never just apply a premium or enhancement fee just to out of state students. The whole concept is that fee is to benefit everybody in that program. Everyone contributes, everyone benefits. Last year we didn't approve any last year because of this.
- g. Clarified that we can put forward enhancement fees but not tuition premium. In conversation with the Chancellor we decided this committee would consider both premium tuition requests and enhancement fee requests and that would go to the Chancellor and BOT and get local endorsement. Then work on conversations with the BOG the benefits of these premium tuition and fees. Another clarification was made that we cannot put either through, so again we want to look at these and see how we can send them up.

VI. Discussion of Premium Tuition Requests and Enhancement Fees

- a. Provost commented that the presenters did a good job and are all justified.
- b. Harries - Comment made briefly about MMB. Came out of an external review of a program. There was strong support from the reviewers for the need.
- c. Berry-James - There was a commonality in the proposals were that they would all include some commitment to increases in scholarships for diverse students. Does this mean if they're not approved there will not be a commitment to scholarships for diverse students?
 - i. Yes, it is linked to the addition of these resources.
- d. Heavlin – In general in favor of them. Appreciated the student feedback in the PCOM enhancement fee.
- e. Vanhoy – really in support of the MMB program.
- f. Brooks – From what am hearing of discussion. Understand it's crucial to be competitive.
- g. Hariharan – hesitant about fees to graduate students, GSSP does not cover students. Knowing it helps the programs be competitive. I can see the benefit.
- h. Ringler – Have a general concern. Understand that colleges need this. When we approved the COE fee, we were venturing into that territory of differential charges for undergrad, which we hadn't done before. This expands that and I expect would expand further. From a financial aid and transparency standpoint, when we publish what the costs are we don't necessarily do that by program. So we create issues where we quote prices that may not be accurate and are different. While all the programs want to put this into scholarships doesn't come to the Financial Aid office. That stays in the college. Their definition of need may not be the federal definition of need. Increased costs, increase need across the board for students who have need. The end result is pooled resources get stretched differently.
- i. Provost asked if anyone has an objection to voting on all four.
 - i. No objections
 - ii. Move made for approval by Molly Vanhoy.
 - iii. Seconded by Hariharan.
 - iv. No further discussion.

v. All voting members in attendance approved and Krista Ringler opposed.

VII. Preliminary testing of different tuition rate scenarios/discussion

- a. Jennifer Coltrane explained the tuition rate scenario spreadsheet. We use this to help make calculations of how increase in tuitions would translate into revenue generated and how we can use that in the four areas.
- b. We had asked Jennifer to populate with 4, 3 and 5 percent.
- c. Walked through scenario 1 as an example.
- d. Will share the spreadsheet with the whole committee to try different scenarios.
- e. Question asked related to inflation. Is that thought about in terms of what the CITI might be or is it independent?
 - i. Not really thought about, it is a good question. The higher Ed price index. Usually about 2 or 3%. Unfortunately like faculty salary increases don't keep pace with inflation.
 - ii. We will get this info and share with the committee.