THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

FINANCIAL CRISIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Friday, August 19, 2016
THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
FINANCIAL CRISIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF THE COMMITTEE

Friday, August 19, 2016
12:00 - 2:00 p.m.
Coe Library 506; University of Wyoming Campus

AGENDA
Call to Order ....................................................................................................................................1

Roll Call and Approval of Minutes..................................................................................................1

Public Session
I. Report from the Revenue Enhancement Committee, Rob Godby .........................1
II. Revenue: New Opportunities and Redistribution (Section II, Section III, Outreach, Foundation, etc.), use in the division plans, use in the Financial Crisis Plan........1
III. General Public Comment...............................................................................................1

Adjournment ....................................................................................................................................1
The University of Wyoming
Minutes of the FCAC
Friday, August 19, 2016
Page 1

**Call to Order**
Chair Steve Bieber called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m.

**Roll Call and Approval of Minutes**
Committee members present included: University President Laurie Nichols, Dean of the College of Law Klint Alexander (via conference phone), Dean of the Outreach School Susan Frye, Dr. Frederic Sterbenz, Dr. Robert Cawley, Dr. Donal O’Toole, Dr. Robert Sprague, Chair Steve Bieber, Ms. Molly Marcusse, Mr. Kevin Colman, Ms. Rachel Stevens, and Mr. Joel Defebaugh.

Dr. Robert Sprague recommended that the word “not” be inserted into sentence two, paragraph four, page six to state “The committee noted that this equation should not eliminate staff, as this group had already seen a large amount of position vacancies” of the Tuesday, August 16, 2016 meeting minutes. Mr. Defebaugh moved to approve the minutes from August 16, 2016 with the amendment. Dr. Sprague seconded. All committee members were in favor; the motion passed unanimously.

**Public Session**
Committee Chair Bieber informed the committee that Athletic Director Tom Burman’s presentation to the FCAC had been rescheduled for Monday, August 29, 2016. He added that beginning Monday, August 29, 2016 the FCAC meetings would now take place on Mondays from 1-3 p.m. and Fridays from 12-2 p.m. A list of meeting times, dates, locations was distributed to the committee members and updated on the FCAC website. Committee Chair Bieber explained that he had been working to increase the awareness of the committee’s charge and the amount of input received from as many different people and groups as possible. He added that many divisions and groups around campus have had listening sessions to ask for input and encouraged FCAC members to attend any meeting that they could or were invited to.

University of Wyoming President Laurie Nichols asked the committee if anyone had read the article that had been published in the Laramie Boomerang earlier in the week. She noted that this article talked about different universities that had undergone similar budget reductions as UW. University President Nichols suggested that the committee set up a conference call with the people at the University of Idaho, another land grant institution mentioned in the article, to obtain some more information past what the article provided. Please see Attachment A for the Laramie Boomerang article.

Committee Chair Bieber noted that he would work on contacting these individuals to set up a conference call for the FCAC members.

**Report from the Revenue Enhancement Committee**
Revenue Enhancement Committee Chair Dr. Rob Godby updated the FCAC on the work that his committee had done in the recent months. He noted that a plan would begin circulating to the campus community for comment in early October. Please see Attachment B, Attachment C, Attachment D, and Attachment E for the materials provided by Dr. Goby.
Dr. Godby explained that the Revenue Enhancement Committee (REC) was a subcommittee of the FCAC, whose charge was to identify areas where there would be possibilities for the university to gain additional revenue, specifically through the implementation of program fees for undergraduate programs on a credit hour basis. He noted that often times these costs would go to consumables that were used in different departments, not necessarily facility and employee costs.

Dr. Goby added that all numbers presented to the FCAC were rough estimates as the official numbers had not been finalized. He explained that the committee had begun to discuss the mandatory fees currently in the fee book and how to begin assessing fees within each specific program. Dr. Godby noted that the main focus of the committee was to retain a good student experience at UW even with the implementation of these fees. He explained that these fees could be used to implement advising centers and other sources within each department that would benefit from the implementation of these fees.

Dr. Godby discussed the difference that Wyoming faced based on the money that had been received from the state in the past. He discussed how UW compared to the comparator institutions that were identified by Brian Schueler across the country. Dr. Godby noted that based on these numbers UW was well below the market price for a university. He explained how the differences between UW and other institutions affected the flexibility that UW had and that UW was operating in a 20th Century budget. Dr. Godby noted that it was not the intention of the REC to make up the entire difference. Dr. Godby noted that the REC hoped to create a calculator that would be used by each individual student to figure out their cost of attendance based on fees that would be assessed of them.

It was further discussed that the REC was working to implement a single fee for each college or course, which will be directly collected by the college or program. Dr. Godby noted that the college or program would then be in charge of reporting out to the campus community how that money was used within the college or program to improve the student experience. He explained that it could be beneficial for students to identify where their fees were going and how they had supported the university and their department and program.

Dr. Godby explained that the process, so far, had consisted of identifying programs that were the highest cost programs, and working to understand where those costs came from and how those fees would work to increase their revenue. The committee also discussed the longer impacts that certain program fee implementation could have on the student experience. Dr. Godby noted that students who graduate from college had a higher average salary over their life time and with the correct programs could be fully prepared to enter the work force or begin graduate school.

Dr. Godby noted that there would be different fees based not only on the college that the student was in but additionally by the program they would be in within each college. Additionally, a tier system for the types of fees that would be implemented was discussed to distinguish how these fees would be directed within each college. He noted that the majority of fees would go directly towards student services.
The committee discussed what the overall impact to the students would be based on a cost increase, and what the prospects of overall success of an implementation of this nature would be. It was noted that the program would need to gain approval from the campus community, the state, and the Board of Trustees. The committee stated that their overall goal was to maintain and increase the quality of the institution even in times of a declining budget. It was asked how this would affect scholarships including athletics scholarships and the Hathaway scholarship, noting that these scholarships may no longer cover as much as they had previously with these implementations.

The committee discussed how this fee implementation might be received by students. It was decided that Dr. Godby should schedule a time to meeting with ASUW to present his materials and that they hopefully receive this information favorably. The committee further discussed how the creation of a semester by semester individual calculator would increase student acceptance because it would be very clearly presented.

A member of the FCAC asked for additional clarification regarding the comparator institutions and how they charged fees. Dr. Godby noted that many of these institutions based the amount on a credit hour basis. He explained that there was a number of ways to assess these fees, each with their pros and cons, however the credit hour basis seemed to fit best for UW. Dr. Godby added that it would be the RECs hope that fees would be assessed based on the course number used to register for the course.

The committee discussed the difference between adding a fee and looking at overall tuition. It was stated that by looking at the implementation of fees, the committee was looking at a form of differential tuition. The committee discussed that there would be no overall look at tuition because that would affect every student, instead of individually based on college. Dr. Godby noted that this fee implementation would increase the amount of transparency that UW provided its students. The committee discussed how fee implementation would allow for each program to flourish for their needs and on a cost based management system.

A member of the FCAC asked what the accountability for each program would be to report back on what the money had been used for to support the students in each college. Dr. Godby explained that the REC had discussed additional measures that needed to be implemented that would direct the colleges on how these numbers should be reported and on what type of timeline. He noted that the REC had discussed a review of fees on a three-year basis to adjust for inflation and to allow for changes to be made if this program is no longer working. The committee clarified that the largest fee being assessed currently was the computer fee.

The committee suggested that some of the fees that are assessed of students be pooled into a college fund that goes towards AV and technology needs for the entire facility to allow for those expenses to not strictly come from the departments. Additionally, it was mentioned that transparency needed to increase so that all fees can be applied to student financial aid. University President Nichols suggested that when a final fee is approved that each college and division provide a budget to show where all the funds would be spent and that these funds should be spent yearly to benefit the students who paid those fees. The committee discussed the difference between general activity fees for programs like athletics and ASUW versus these program fees and how each was assessed.
of the students. The committee stressed the importance of receiving student input before anything was officially put into place.

Committee Chair Bieber noted that students should know what they are paying for and having the number based on specific things, instead of strictly being told what they should be paying based on national standards. The committee discussed how lucky UW had been with receiving so much support from the state in the past. Dr. Godby noted that many institutions had benefited from sizeable budget cuts because it allowed them to ask the difficult questions and reevaluate the system they were operating under.

A member of the FCAC noted that for a program like this to work, the entire campus community would need to stand together to enforce and implement this process. It was also noted that these extra fees would allow for more top notch equipment and supplies to be utilized in the different programs across campus. The committee discussed if these changes would allow for UW to begin moving towards a decentralized budget. This would allow the departments to have more control over how their money is spent.

Committee Chair Bieber noted that the committee should take the information presented and bring that information into the upcoming division presentations to get to a final plan. The committee noted that these fees would be most applicable to the presentation given by Academic Affairs. It was noted that in addition to revenue these fees could also result in different reallocations. University President Nichols explained that when looking at where these funds were being sent, all departments would need to be taken into consideration so everyone would receive support. The committee also discussed the cost to run the new buildings on campus and where those funds should come from across campus and how that should be taken into consideration in the future.

Public Comment
Sophia Beck, a staff member in the American Studies Department, suggested that there be an increase in the amount that students pay for their diploma fee when they graduate from the university, stating that this was a less noticeable place to increase fees for students. She also noted that there should be a fee for students to withdraw from a course after the specified deadline to assist with new revenue sources.

Trustee Mike Massie stated that he and a few trustees had begun researching the amount of student debt UW graduates had in comparison to the newly identified comparator institutions. He noted that this was something that should be taken into consideration by the FCAC as well, as they begin to formulate their plan.

Adjournment
Mr. Defebaugh moved that the committee adjourn the meeting. Dr. Sprague seconded. The committee adjourned at 1:51 p.m.
An outside perspective: Universities employ similar budget cut strategies as UW

By Thaddeus Mast

thaddeusm@laramieboomerang.com | Posted: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 5:00 am

Gov. Matt Mead’s total cut of $35 million to the University of Wyoming is pushing administrators to employ many cost-saving strategies, but other regional institutions have tried the same ideas.

The University of North Dakota is facing similar problems, as parts of its budget are directly tied to the state and, in turn, the energy market, said Peter Johnson, interim vice president for university and public affairs.

“We’ve gone through a rebudgeting process that was predicated on the fact the governor of the state, in February, ordered all state agencies to cut back 4.05 percent,” he said. “We’re also dealing with some budget issues unrelated to that. We ended up reshaping our budget by about $21.5 million. When I say reshaping, I don’t necessarily mean cut the budget. We met our obligations in terms of cutting, but we also took the opportunity to reposition where some of those dollars were going.”

Unlike UW’s short planning time to deal with the cuts for fiscal year 2017, the University of North Dakota was already planning a restructuring, Johnson said.

“We were already pretty well along this road,” he said. “All of those things came into play for us, including eliminating positions. In some cases, reorganizing some units so that, in some cases, some of the work had been determined some units weren’t needed anymore. We also consolidated leadership lines.”

Like many other universities in tough financial shape, the University of North Dakota turned to jobs and positions to trim the budget, Johnson said.

“We also did some elimination of positions, about 138, many of which were vacant,” he said. “We lost about 20 individuals who lost their jobs to the process. We also eliminated a few programs. We made use of some funding that was already available and was going to be used in other ways. We employed a lot of strategies to pull this together.”

While many positions were cut, the North Dakota Legislature offered some help to the university in terms of employee salaries with certain stipulations.

“The Legislature had allocated enough money to bring everyone’s paycheck up an average of 3 percent, but it also said, ‘We don’t want you to give across-the-board raises — we want you to provide dollars for those who are doing the best work and those that need to be brought up-to-speed from a market standpoint,’” Johnson said. “The president could have taken that money and put it toward defraying the cost of the decrease, but decided to not do that.”

Johnson said about 23 percent of the University of North Dakota’s total funding comes from the state, but that money is very important to the overall operation.
“That 23 percent is critical, because it’s what allows us to go after the rest of the money,” he said. “If you don’t have that, there’s nothing to get research money. There’s no way to get local dollars. It really is the crucial piece.”

The University of Montana is also facing the repercussions of budget problems, but not from low energy prices — low enrollment caused a loss of millions of dollars through lost tuition and fees, said Cary Shimek, communication manager for university relations.

“We had some cases with some high-profile rape cases on campus,” he said. “About 2012 was the height of our crisis, and since then, we’ve been doing whatever we can to make ourselves the safest campus in America and recover from this situation.”

Competition with other universities, particularly Montana State University, also kept enrollment low.

“The declining enrollment has meant we’ve laid off employees,” Shimek said. “We had a couple hundred employees. We had some one-time monies to stave off the cuts, hoping to turn things around, but it slid more than we liked, and in the end, we had to cut some people, both faculty and staff. A lot of those were not renewing positions.”

Going against the grain, the University of Idaho shied away from eliminating positions during its last financial crisis in 2008-2010, Budget Director Trina Mahoney said. However, that wasn’t necessarily the best choice.

“To be honest, we did a lot more Draconian across-the-board cuts,” she said. “I think the leadership team had the idea that — we had to act fast, because the state didn’t give us a lot of time — so, the thought process went to across-the-board cuts and then go back and look at things like internal reallocations and really decide what areas we should have cut and what areas we should have invested.”

Mahoney explained the University of Idaho is very decentralized — the cuts were essentially handed down to individual unit leaders to work with instead of having a large overview analyzing the overall institutional picture.

“In hindsight, we should have had a more centralized process,” she said. “Understandably, most units did everything they could to preserve positions, and so they cut their operating budgets, which can work to a certain extent, but we got to the point where some colleges couldn’t operate with the budgets they had.”

The University of Idaho also gets large support from the state — about 50 percent of its operating budget is paid through state funding, Mahoney said.

“We were in a similar position as Wyoming, where, percentage-wise, we had pretty good state support, but that made it almost more painful when the cuts came,” she said.

Students ended up taking a brunt of the cuts through increased tuition and fees, Mahoney said. At the time, program reviews were not used because of the across-the-board budget cut strategy.

“After that, we did have a program prioritization process we went through which is now a recurring process that we go and give them feedback on,” she said.
A retirement and separation incentive program was also conducted at the University of Idaho, Mahoney said.

“The (University of Idaho) also did early retirement programs throughout the years with mixed results,” she said. “What we found was that some of the people that left were some of the people we least wanted to leave. It definitely made some vacancies and allowed us to shuffle some things around, but I’m not sure we’d consider it again.”

All three university spokespeople said their respective institution is coming out stronger after finding cuts and increasing efficiencies.

“My advice to any other institution is don’t waste a good crisis,” Mahoney said. “Times like this — while it’s difficult, are the best times to look at your program mix and deciding if there are things you don’t want to be doing anymore and is this a good opportunity to start phasing those out.”
Revenue Enhancement Committee: Report to FCAC

August 19, 2016

Rob Godby – Economics and Finance
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Rob Godby chair
Mary Burman vice-chair, Health Sciences
Anne Alexander Academic Affairs
Michael Pishko Engineering
Ricki Klages Visual & Performing Arts
Susan Frye/Reed Scull Outreach
Greg Brown A&S, STEM
Denise Gable Health Sciences
Gerry Andrews Agriculture
John Mittelstaedt Business
Suzie Young Education

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
REVENUESOURCES

- State funds
- Tuition + mandatory fees
- Program fees
- Outreach (self-support)
- Research/tech transfer
- 3rd party contracts
- Foundation/private gifts
- User charges
- Other entrepreneurial activities
COMMITTEE CHARGE

To develop a program fee proposal, assessed by credit hour and to be comprehensive, replacing all existing course and program fees in the affected area.
COMMITTEE TIMELINE

Release initial proposal  
Gather feedback  
Make revisions  
Trustee consideration

Aug-Sept  
September  
Early October  
November
COMMITTEE APPROACH

- Focused on undergraduate program fees
- Must be cost-based and benefit students
- Not all programs can have fees
- General benefit (freed up funds can be used elsewhere)
- Examples of cost justifications
INSTRUCTION COST

UW Annual Instruction Cost per Full Time Enrollment = $14,616 (FY 2014)
UW Academic Year Tuition and Required Fees, Full Time Undergraduate = $4,646 (AY 2014)

Courtesy Anne Alexander
INSTRUCTION COST

Average of Comparators, Annual Instruction Cost/Full Time Student = $13,738 (FY 2014)
Average of 50 Comparators, Academic Year Tuition and Required Fees, Full Time Undergraduate = $10,020 (AY 2014)

27%
73%

· Academic Year Tuition and Required Fees Full time undergraduate
· Balance of instruction cost/full time enrollment covered by institution

Courtesy Anne Alexander
MARKET INFORMATION

AMONG 11 PEER COMPARATOR SCHOOLS (2016/17)

- Tuition: UW 187%
- Mandatory Fees: UW 135%
**MARKET INFORMATION**

AMONG 11 COMPARATOR SCHOOLS

10 of 11 have program fees
Most common: Business, Engineering, Nursing, Arts, Sciences/Quantitative.

Range from $2 - $137 per credit hour
Average: $45.90
CURRENT FEES

• Current Program and course fees (fee book pp 27-34, UG only):
  • Program fees: 11 separate UG college-wide fees
  • Course fees: 86+ courses listed with separate fees
  • Other misc. fees: 40+ specific fees

• Current revenues (2015-16) for all fees pp. 27-34:
  • $1.4 million approximately.

• Proposed Program fees: will replace most of these with a single
  program fee for college, program or discipline area.
  • Some fees will remain
PROGRESS

• Identified programs with additional costs.

• Identification of costs for institutional priorities (advising, career support, etc.) that will benefit students
  • Improve retention rates
  • Improve graduation rates
  • Improve placement

• Identified market competitive program fees through comparator analysis.
PROGRESS

Proposal will likely include the following program fees:

1) Single College-wide program fees – vary by college
   • Engineering
   • Business
   • A&S
   • Agriculture
   • Education
   • Health Science
   • ENR
PROGRESS

2) High cost program fees – vary by program
   • Science and Quantitative classes (Sci-Q)
     • Follow NSF STEM designated areas
     • Three tiers of cost depending on specific costs of programs
     • Across colleges (Ag and A&S Science areas)
   • Visual and Performing Arts
   • Heath Science – separate fees for programs
     • Nursing
     • Kinesiology and Heath
   • ENR
Revenue Generation

• Estimate that fees currently being considered will generate $4 million to $5 million in new revenues annually
  • Net $3 million to $4 million
  • Some current fees will also remain

• Much of the new revenues will be used to
  • Maintain, expand and improve existing student services
    • Includes some new expenditures
  • Cover escalating program costs due to inflation to assure instruction quality not impacted and improved where possible.
  • Cover unbudgeted new instructional costs (e.g. Enzi building technology)
QUESTIONS?

Rob Godby
Economics and Finance
rgodby@uwyo.edu
307-766-3843
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Res/Non-Resident Tuition (10 cr or less)</th>
<th>Effective cost/credit hr</th>
<th>Manditory Fees</th>
<th>Total Fees</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Science/ Nursing</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Art</th>
<th>S&amp;A</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>Honors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
<td>Laramie</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>$3,720</td>
<td>$242.00</td>
<td>$1,882</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>Rocky Mount</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>$3,984</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
<td>$2,102</td>
<td>$6,110</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa City</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>$4,390</td>
<td>$270.00</td>
<td>$2,520</td>
<td>$7,310</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada</td>
<td>Reno</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>$3,884</td>
<td>$243.00</td>
<td>$1,908</td>
<td>$5,792</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
<td>$241.00</td>
<td>$1,902</td>
<td>$5,682</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>$3,820</td>
<td>$243.00</td>
<td>$1,908</td>
<td>$5,792</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
<td>$253.00</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
<td>$6,332</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
<td>$253.00</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
<td>$6,332</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
<td>$253.00</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
<td>$6,332</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
<td>$253.00</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
<td>$6,332</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Salt Lake</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>$3,820</td>
<td>$243.00</td>
<td>$1,908</td>
<td>$5,792</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Montana</td>
<td>Missoula</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>$4,248</td>
<td>$261.00</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
<td>$6,332</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
<td>$253.00</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
<td>$6,332</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri State University</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>$3,820</td>
<td>$243.00</td>
<td>$1,908</td>
<td>$5,792</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State University</td>
<td>Mankato</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
<td>$253.00</td>
<td>$2,252</td>
<td>$6,332</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>$3,820</td>
<td>$243.00</td>
<td>$1,908</td>
<td>$5,792</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
<td>$241.00</td>
<td>$1,902</td>
<td>$5,682</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota University</td>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$3,984</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
<td>$2,102</td>
<td>$6,110</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota State University</td>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$3,984</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
<td>$2,102</td>
<td>$6,110</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota State University</td>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$3,984</td>
<td>$276.00</td>
<td>$2,102</td>
<td>$6,110</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
<td>$241.00</td>
<td>$1,902</td>
<td>$5,682</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>Grand Forks</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>$3,780</td>
<td>$241.00</td>
<td>$1,902</td>
<td>$5,682</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Research 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>URM%</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of URM</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of URM</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change refers to change in percentage or rate.*
Guiding Principles, Policies for Justification and Expenses Allowed

The guiding principles we think should underpin and are paramount in program and academic support fees and their administration include:

(1) Access: Fees should not be prohibitive to major or program choice of the student to encourage a diverse workforce.

(2) Transparency: Students should be able to quickly and simply discern what fees are charged, when they can expect them, what they are for, and the benefits they receive from them. New program fees shall, where possible, replace existing fees to avoid unnecessary complexity and to ensure true costs of programs are clear.

(3) Benefit Basis: Program support fees should have clear benefits to the students paying them.

(4) Cost Basis: Program support fees should be based on the actual cost of providing specific benefits to students paying the fees.

(5) Accountability: Financial control and accountability should be built into the fee structure. On a regular basis, programs should share the sources and uses of their fees and directly map ex ante intentions with ex post results.

(6) Efficiency: Programs should ensure that curriculum and co-curriculum experiences are delivered in a cost-efficient manner. In addition, administration of fees should not be unnecessarily complex.

(7) Impact and Flexibility: Programs should monitor impacts to their enrollments and student success measures. They should respond to noticeable changes in the external market factors and in student behavior induced by programs fees.

Policies that support these fees must be crafted to uphold those principles.

Justification of fees: As outlined above, both the actual cost and benefit of programming to students in the program should be the principled basis for program fees. Justifications must be explicit and based on reasonable forecasts of costs and benefits. All justifications must include an impact analysis of a proposed fee on students, including multiple fees a student may incur and how the stacking of fees might affect behavior.

Benefits of fees: Some potential benefits that fees can be used to support include

- Instructional capacity/seat guarantees;
- Instructional material and equipment costs for the program;
- Support for the program’s students’ experiential learning, including internships, field experiences, study abroad, and apprenticeships;
- Support for the program’s students’ professional advising; student success services;
- A source of funds for rapid response to cover additional program expenses or additional needs brought forward jointly by students and faculty.
Expenses Justified: Expenses that may be justified by program fees include

- Instructional equipment, supplies, and materials purchases;
- Student success support, such as staff, faculty, or graduate assistant funding that supports the program's academic advising, tutoring, supplemental instruction, and career advising.
- Salary enhancement to maintain faculty.
- Flexible instructional funding (including lab supervision, part-time instructors, student workers for the program's courses), or salary paid to support staff providing direct support to the program or graduate and undergraduate teaching assistants for the program.
- Travel and other reasonable costs for students in the program, including field trips, professional development, clinical placements or experiential learning purposes.
- Professional examinations and preparation.
- Assessment and accreditation costs.

Market Basis: Fees will be justified by comparison to relevant market and comparator institutions. Further, fee basis may also consider market salary for graduates of specific programs and other aspects of program demand.

Assessment of fees: Approach should be consistent across programs. For transparency and simplicity, credit hour fees following course codes at all levels, lower- and upper-division, should be the method of assessment. Definition of "Program": Program fees may be applied by college, area (for example STEM areas), or discipline. For example, a Sci/CQ (Science and Quantitative) fee on specific courses, or credit hour fee on all course codes within a college will be considered.

Implementation and transition: A proposal for replacement of existing program fees, and possible adjustment of the Mandatory Student Fee, will be formulated by the end of August 2016. Existing entrepreneurial and differential tuition schemes should be left in place; the main goal of this proposal is to amalgamate and replace many existing “Program and Special Course Fees” listed in Section IV of the current Fee Book. Fees may be assessed across all students initially, or phased in by cohort. Fees may also be initially phased in at a discounted rate and rise over time to reduce impacts. Merits and disadvantages of such considerations will be considered. The Mandatory Student Fee may also be adjusted, along with certain aspects of Outreach fees.

Existing program fees for experiences away from the UW campus — regardless of location and length of program — should be consolidated into a manageable, transparent, simple group of field experience fees.

Computer fees, challenge exams, and internships / clinical fees should, to the extent possible, be placed into program fees for the college or streamlined and simplified.
ATTACHMENT E