

## Minutes: Revenue Enhancement Committee

August 1, 9:00 am OM 321

Primary purpose – Develop fee proposals by area

- Anne – Revenue from existing fees report, any updates on Principles document for newer members.
- Discuss approach developing proposed fees
- fees at comparative institutions
  - o Data collected since last meeting – some changes though not many
- Continued work on questions for committee from last meeting:
  1. Define the program fee categories we will be thinking of: e.g. ENG, BUS, HS, Sci-Q, etc
  2. What are the anticipated course codes affected under each fee category?
    - a. How do we justify those
    - b. Should a department for example once identified, charge a fee on all its UG classes or only those with additional cost – the ANTH question above
  3. Which categories will have differential fees underneath them – for example SciQ may charge a different fee on Math than Chem classes – this will need to be justified on the basis of cost.
  4. Will there still be other college fees beyond ENG, EDUC, BUS and HS for example) where fees will exist because of higher costs – e.g. A&S, Ag college-wide fees that could cover possible new initiatives to improve student retention such as advising centers – funding new positions to centralize advising to improve retention and grad rates over faculty advising in place now?
    - a. Obviously we have to be careful how many fees we create – there have to be places where fees are minimal as the state already provides faculty and facility.
- Outreach fees? Reed Scull update?
- Reminder – no meeting Thursday
- Other Items not yet known?
- 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: Rob Godby, Michael Pishko, Susan Frye, Mary Burman, Denise Gable, Reed Scull, Anne Alexander, Gerry Andrews, John Mittelstaedt, Suzie Young, Ricki Klages, Paula Lutz for Greg Brown

Absent: Greg Brown

Clarification to previous minutes – correction for meeting minutes on 28<sup>th</sup> (change word excluded to included) regarding NSF STEM identified disciplines.

Anne presented the revenue data collected on existing fee-book course and program fees. Noted there are some disparities regarding fees collected as occasionally there are unaccounted for

revenues included in accounts designated for existing fees. For this reason two reports were represented – a fee report including only the fees as designated in the accounting system, and an “all-revenue report” that included other contributions to these accounts. Differences appear due to details included in the entries to the accounts. Revenues from fees specified only report total \$1.6- \$1.8 million in FY2015, while with additional revenues included increases sum to \$2.4 - \$2.6 million. Difference is another example of why the institution is updating its accounting system.

It was noted we can use the uber-report (in dropbox) of course enrollments and existing fees to double-check numbers. It was also made clear that by UW policy fees are not refunded and therefore withdrawals do not affect revenue totals.

Question – did FCAC decision to allow the additional \$15 million to be cut in FY18 while allowing 35% of this total to be made up in new revenues include the committee work here? Rob answered he has never been directed that this is the committee’s target but clearly this could be a source of additional revenue.

Discussion followed about upcoming Trustee presentation Rob will make this Thursday. Committee suggested issues that Rob may have to address including concerns of cost increases and student aid. Questions included degree of comparative state support versus tuition support for instruction costs.

Comparator list reviewed. There has been a change – Rob ascertained after the meeting that University of New Mexico Main campus has been dropped from aspirational list.

With respect to proposal development questions in agenda – only one proposal was discussed – John presented how he thought a Business proposal would look and included an updated document. Document focused on comparative costs at other schools in our comparator set, and the potential revenue difference using the undergraduate hours reported in UW business departments in AY2014-15 from the Delaware prepared dataset.

Mary raised concerns that any proposal that in part helped fund improvements to faculty market-salary differentials could be problematic on campus – creating “have” and “have-not” departments between those with and without the benefit of program fees. John noted ensuring faculty are available is crucial but the committee agreed that a general salary policy will be needed on campus, though outside the scope of the committee currently.

General concern was noted by Paula regarding the potential question of whether program fees could drive students away from “expensive programs. Committee noted that research suggests that empirically this is not widespread elsewhere though women and lower income families and those from minorities may be disproportionately affected. Overall, however program fees may increase cost of school for some students by as much as 15%, leaving us still well over 505 below comparator institutions. Concerns along this regard though were noted and will have to be addressed in the proposal.

Mary noted Health Science is looking at different program fees by some areas within the college with a common advising fee.

Homework – If others have not done so please send Rob a general outline on how program fee proposals may look for Tuesday afternoon so that he can incorporate that info into the Trustees

presentation. Specifically the course codes that could be affected and possible justifications (broad – data is not yet needed) on the reasons for the fee in these areas.

Also note – no meeting Thursday!

Meeting adjourned 10:40.

Discussion for meeting focused on