

Minutes: Revenue Enhancement Committee

July 28, 9:00 am OM 321

Primary purpose – Develop fee proposals by area – work session discussing issues

Agenda:

Dean Burman reviewed the questions from Rob:

- Define the program fee categories we are thinking about
- What codes are impacted?
- Where are there differentials
- Where will fees exist within college?

Mary Burman chaired as Rob was away.

Attending: Michael Pishko, Susan Frye, Mary Burman, Denise Gable, Reed Scull, Anne Alexander, Gerry Andrews, John Mittelstaedt, Suzie Young, Paula Lutz for Greg Brown

Absent: Ricki Klages, Rob Godby, Greg Brown

Minutes taken by Reed Scull

Suzie Young was introduced. Dean Lutz joined us representing Greg Brown.

Gerry noted for the CANR that his college is thinking of college wide fees with a few program fees, such as Dietetics and FCSC. The program fees will go toward student services. The system of fees will be simple and could be applied to 85% or more of students.

Michael asked whether course specific fees could remain in the fee book. There were a variety of opinions, but making fees simpler is the emphasis. Paula noted the SciQ fee is an effort to simplify matters for the students. The fee is likely to be assessed to students who take courses, but would support the overall program. As fee systems simplify, there would be a more dependable and less controversial application across students who take courses within the program, whether they be in the program or not.

Gerry continued and noted that a cost average across programs could be the basis for the college fee.

The idea of having a corp of professional advisors was noted, and some on the committee are contemplating a fee covering this cost. Faculty who want to advise can advise, but others cannot.

Paula noted that there have been attempts to get course specific fees approved, but have not been accepted in the past. A more systemic set of fees across each college is the new approach for this upcoming request.

Gerry returned to categories of costs that could be paid for by a fee. Consumables as well as student services. Anne reviewed a list of colleges noting they are examining proposals, from A&S SciQ fee to Engineering, to Nursing, to Business to Outreach. Paula noted the SciQ and Performing Arts fees. NIH or NSF funded disciplines will be included from SciQ coverage. SciQ might possibly run across colleges. Other acceptable costs to look at include accreditation, noted Susan.

Mary noted that K&H may well have a specific fee for a special anatomy course and he will probably be consulting with Greg about inclusion in the SciQ fee structure. There was a discussion on the LIFE program fee, which may be related, and examining the overlaps may be helpful.

Mary noted that college based and unit fees are the formula.

John provided a handout on the college of business. The handout includes the “making the case” arguments, the comparison with comparators, costs analysis, and a credit hour breakdown. The promise to students and measures of success/accountability. Retention, graduation, job placement are the COB metrics. The educational experience is the focus of arguments, both in the classroom and beyond. If there are personnel costs, it will be important to include the EPBs in calculations. John noted his discussions with CSU and its business dean, who had three dimensions for setting fees. John noted the FCAC requirement that 35% percent of the AY 2018 cuts may be made up by fees, with 65% consisting of cuts.

Paula asked about refunds on program fees, and the consensus was that they should not be refundable, as most administrative fees are. It needs to be clearly stated in the proposal that they are non-refundable.

Mary noted that the Health Sciences fees are likely to be a college fee and program specific fees, including an interprofessional activities.

On Monday, the proposals don't have to be finely polished, but something that is going to give Rob a sense of where a college is headed. The internal distribution across programs should be noted eventually as proposals develops.

John noted that we should be mentioning how many efficiencies we have already developed prior to asking for fee increases. Distribution methods within the college could be mentioned, but the context is different from college to college and therefore the distribution formulas could be different.

The OS plan will include an IPO, ELC, and a revised delivery fee for UWC an OCP. For the delivery fee, we looked at credit hour generation over a three year period.

Paula suggested to Suzie to link cost structures to the Education Initiative. Accreditation fees need to be costed as well as articulation costs. These are ongoing costs and are both important from an academic and policy perspective.

Mary noted that many of the “Section 4” Fee book fees should be simplified. Fees should be attached to classes by credit hour. Undeclared students should pay per credit hour fees.

Texas Tech has a great website with a cost calculator.