

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

Wednesday, October 6, 2021

12:30 pm – 2:00 pm

Zoom

1. Review of Last Meeting and Observations
  - a. Provost Arden reminded the committee that at the last meeting the committee spent a few minutes looking at the effect of various percentage increases to tuition for both out of state under grad and grad as well as the four distribution categories.
  - b. He also stated the spreadsheet was shared with the committee for review.
  - c. He had initially asked Jennifer to put 3%, 4% and 5% as scenarios to consider. He also stated that the committee can look at splitting as well meaning half percent options.
  - d. Before reviewing the spreadsheet, the Provost made a couple of comments. First, he stated that that he does think we need an increase on out of state tuition. We are always very low compared with our peers and have been for many years. For many years the directives from the system office was to be market driven or at a mid-point, which we are not. Second is that if the increase is too low and all you do is end up giving the revenue generated back to offset financial aid and GSSP, really all you're doing is increasing tuition and then expanding the resources to offset the costs for some students. He would like to generate some revenue for quality and accessibility which benefits all students on campus and give to faculty promotion.
2. Review of percentages proposed and expenses for each category
  - a. The committee had discussions on the spreadsheet provided to look at different percentage scenarios.
  - b. Comments/questions from the committee:
    - i. Hinks - Supports wanting to increase to give to quality and accessibility and faculty promotion.
    - ii. Heavlin - Support scenario 4 (3.5 and 4.5) or scenario 1 (4 for both). Scenario four does bring undergraduate out of state below graduate. Also a fan of scenario one because it does have that million dollar allocation in the accessibility category.
    - iii. Vanhoy – Supports scenario four as well.
    - iv. Harries – Pushing scenario four and support it as well.

- v. Arden – Scenario four is a modification of scenario one, allows for a slight adjustment to bring graduate and undergraduate programs more in line and have graduate slightly ahead of undergraduate.
- vi. Stewart – If we went with scenario four where would that put us with our peers?
  - 1. Arden - Hard to say because we don't know what our peers are going to do. Would bet it keeps pace and somewhere second or third from the lowest.
- vii. Liu – think there is an expected increase with undergrad due to inflation but concerned about graduate. Asked to consider 4% for grad.
  - 1. Coltrane - When you do this, if you're trying to achieve the goal of undergrad paying less than grad you have to do a full 1% difference.
- c. Provost asked for any additional comments and input.
- d. Sounds like the committee is in favor of 3.5 for out of state undergrad and 4.5 for out of state grad.
- e. Next the committee reviewed distribution.
  - i. We would but 1.7 million in need based financial aid, 1.8 million to GSSP, just shy of a million for quality and accessibility and close to a million for faculty promotion.
- f. Question raised by Krista Ringler – have we considered doing a flat amount of tuition instead of percentages. The spreadsheet was updated with dollar amounts of 1,000 flat each. This left the undergrads paying more than the grads. One observation with doing this, there is an external layer of discussion to defend a 3.66 vs. a 3.5.
- g. Question asked by Molly Vanhoy – does the current distribution in scenario four cover GSSP completely and does it get us above 70% of financial aid coverage? Provost stated he believe it does but asked Peter to confirm. Peter confirmed we would be fine. Krista was asked to comment on the financial aid part. Krista stated that similar to the GSSP these numbers are based on expectations of what enrollment will be and expectations of what student eligibility for aid will be so apply for aid annually, so the numbers will look different. In general, based on calculations should help hold those students harmless.
- h. Provost stated that he is hearing a consensus for scenario four and distribution stated for scenario four. Asked for a motion approval of that scenario.
  - i. Motion made by Molly Vanhoy.
  - ii. Motion seconded by Peter Harries.

- iii. Approved by the following voting member:
    - 1. Warwick Arden
    - 2. McKenzy Heavlin
    - 3. Tsailu Liu
    - 4. David Hinks
    - 5. Barbara Moses on behalf of Charlie Maimone
    - 6. Peter Harries
    - 7. Jade Berry-James
    - 8. Lisa Zapata on behalf of Doneka Scott
    - 9. Molly Vanhoy
    - 10. Krista Ringler
  - iv. Absent Members:
    - 1. Deveshwar Hariharan
    - 2. Brianna Brooks
  - i. Final recommendation is as follows:
    - i. 3.5% increase for out of state undergrads
    - ii. 4.5% increase for out of state grads
    - iii. Distributions:
      - 1. Need based financial aid ~ 1,700,000
      - 2. GSSP ~ 1,850,000
      - 3. Faculty Promotional Increases – 1,000,000
      - 4. Q&A ~ 916,000
    - iv. Any leftover funds from holding GSSP harmless, Financial Aid and Promotions will go to quality and accessibility.
3. Approval of Minutes from October 1 Meeting
- a. Motion made to approve by Molly Vanhoy
  - b. Seconded by Barbara Moses.
  - c. Unanimous approval.
4. Wrap-up and Thanks
- a. Provost Arden thanked the committee for their work and stated this has been very open and positive. While we are increasing, it's not astronomical and keeps us relatively low for both inside and out of state. Would like more to invest in programs but we will do what we can to enhance the opportunity for all of our students across campus.
  - b. McKenzy Heavlin thanked the committee for their engagement and has loved the discussions and process.