

Minutes: Revenue Enhancement Committee

July 25, 9:00 am OM 321

Primary purpose – Develop fee proposals by area

- Anne – Principles document update
- Discuss approach developing proposed fees
- fees at comparative institutions
 - o Data collected since last meeting – some changes though not many
 - o Faculty salaries – OSU data
- Outreach fees? Reed Scull
- Coming absences...
- Other
 - o Trustees meeting
 - o Town Hall
 - o Other?
- Committee homework forward.
 - o Rob has copies of recent fee proposals – not yet summarized.
 - o Continue to collect comparator data
 - o Begin writing a proposal document

Attending: Michael Pishko, Susan Frye, Mary Burman, Denise Gable, Reed Scull, Anne Alexander, Rob Godby, Greg Brown, Gerry Andrews, John Mittelstaedt.

Absent: Ricki Klages

Note – Suzie Young will join the group on behalf of the education College next meeting.

Meeting began with a review of previous meeting points from President Nichols and changes to our Principles document needed. Anne revised the document for the following points:

- Committee decided to eliminate references to financial aid under Access in the first principle on page 1 as per President Nichol's direction described in last minutes regarding financial aid.
- Deleted references to financial aid and discounting of tuition on second last bullet of page 2. Eventually entire bullet was eliminated at suggestion of committee.
- Added references to direct support for undergraduate GAs, teaching aid under fourth bullet of expense justification on page 2.
- Modified assessment of fees on page 3 to only include charges by credit hour based on course code for all students.
- Modified description of assessment to be comprehensive, replacing all fees in fee book in section 4, for a particular college or discipline.

Discussion regarding replacement of college computer fees with common base mandatory fee of \$34 since all colleges but CAES have same \$34 program fee currently. Concern voiced a mandatory fee would go into general pool and not to colleges. Anne suggested specifying chart-fields this fee would be paid to, or alternatively it should be include in the new program fee proposals. Since

these fees will go to college this may be a better plan, but does not solve problem for colleges that do not have a college-wide fee in any new proposals.

Discussion whether to include grad fees or not in proposals. Noted pros and cons to this with respect to stipend consequences and fact this could reduce value of stipends and state support on already uncompetitive GA funding at UW.

Gerry Andrews noted cross-listed classes will have to be dealt with under any fee proposal if they bridge fee areas. Greg also noted graduate cross-listed classes could be a problem. Committee noted both details will have to be addressed in new proposals.

Mary Burman requested a clarification in previous minutes regarding point made regarding flow of possible differential tuitions paid to general tuition pool and not departments. Wanted to make it clear that program fees go to department supplying course that incurs the charge. Change has been made.

From this discussion committee agreed to add to principles document that existing differential tuition or program fees for professional and graduate programs would be grandfathered in and not affected by new policies.

Greg noted that some summer classes, for example, include a charge for lab or trips. Asked how these would be combined in newly proposed fees. Given these are pass-through for specific courses taken voluntarily outside of regular course experience to cover costs, it was suggested these should be moved to some section like those addressed on page 46 of fee book for international fees section. Possible a new section could be created for such travel fees in classes outside fall and spring session since they are not mandatory parts of programs. General agreement such a section for exceptions could be created – again a decision that will be dealt with in actual proposals. Re-affirmed general principle that where possible, existing course fees would be replaced by new program fees.

Some discussion on justifiable expenses – some concerns about faculty salary enhancement and possible optics of assessing a fee and then giving a raise to faculty. Counterpoint – retention of good faculty should be a benefit of such fees when such enhancements are needed. Decision to leave such justifications to individual program fee justifications. Noted this justification may only apply to specific programs where market salaries are very uncompetitive.

Rob explained reasoning in process he outlined in last minutes regarding the process to define a program fee. General agreement this was an approach that seemed workable. Rob noted that Trustee's retreat is Aug 4th and it would be helpful if some preliminary fee proposals had moved far enough to be shared with Trustees to show how principles document is applied.

Reed Scull addressed how he anticipated developing an Outreach fee for services rendered by Outreach. He suggested justification on a number of areas including platform and delivery, advising, proctoring, course and student outcomes and grade management. Will also include a set of comparisons that where possible reflect comparator group the university has chosen, and market competitors in online delivery.

General discussion on how multiple fees may create significant cost increases due to stacking effect of cumulative impacts – suggested that program fees from other areas be carefully considered for potential interaction with other proposed fees.

Rob asked if fee proposals from all groups could be readied by meeting August 1st so that some can be shown at Trustee's meeting. Concept is to follow to have draft proposals following the steps outlined in the July 21 meeting minutes as previously noted.

Susan presented a short historic summary considering the Wyoming constitution phrase "as nearly free as possible" regarding tuition. Noted other states had similar language, with Arizona having nearly identical wording to Wyoming's, and North Carolina having very similar language. Noted that Wyoming Attorney General's office noted in 1989 this language was actually advisory. Susan also noted Arizona and North Carolina have had Supreme Court judgements affirming the advisory nature of their constitutions' similar references to tuition.

Some discussion on how fee proposal will be justified in proposal document – concern that it will be controversial to float proposals we are considering due to costs. Rob outlined general justifications he is considering – others can focus on development of fee proposals or identification of possible affected fees in Fee Book.

Next meeting July 28th – Rob will be absent – Mary will chair meeting. This will be a general work session to discuss initial fee proposals.

August 4th meeting cancelled due to number of people who will be away.

We will meet August 1st to discuss initial proposals and possible presentation to Trustees if necessary or useful.

Homework:

Anne – Principles document update.

Everyone – Development of areas/college fee proposals for the 1st.

Rob begin preamble, developing materials in Dropbox and finding Education rep. (Note – after meeting Suzie Young was appointed to the committee and will attend the July 28th meeting).

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 am.

