

Minutes - Revenue Enhancement Committee

August 11, 9:00 am OM 321

Primary purpose – Develop fee proposals by area

Agenda

- Huron document – quick explanation
- Doug Wachob – ENR proposal
- Suzie Young – Education proposal
- Anne – Honors/IPO/Mandatory fee changes
- Other proposals – progress and questions.
- Other issues?
 - o Monday meeting – will need a chair – rob will be away

Previous outline of how we are proceeding – note due date decided last meeting for proposal drafts to Rob.

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.
5. Proposals will follow the analysis template John created where possible.
6. Proposals in final draft form by area due to Rob August 22nd but glad to get them early for feedback!

Minutes (unless otherwise noted, minutes prepared by Rob Godby):

Attending: Denise Gable, Reed Scull, Gerry Andrews, Anne Alexander, Suzie Young, Ricki Klages, Rob Godby, Greg Brown, Paul Dellenback (for Dean Pishko)

Absent: Susan Frye, Mary Burman, John Mittelstaedt, Michael Pishko

Rob updated committee on Huron presentation and breakdown of comparative revenues and expenditures relative to peer group provided by Huron at Trustees' Retreat the previous Thursday.

Doug Wachob described the ENR fee proposal he has created. He noted that ENR supports a significant amount of course costs and advising through Section II monies – in particular, advising is very important as ENR has so many double-majors.

He also noted that existing fees for field courses and international topics will be moved to the Summer session and international programs areas of the fee book since they are pass-through and not required for all students in program.

Fee proposed is \$47.90 / cr hr.

Doug noted that there will have to be issues resolved with respect to provision of crosslisted classes and how fees are charged.

Anne provided an update on an Honors Program fee. She noted that Susan their program director preferred to assess a semester only fee and to make it a \$25 charge. The committee asked if she realized how little revenue this would create. Anne noted Susan was very worried about pricing students out of the program, however the committee asked if Susan really realized what she was giving up. Since there will be an Honors College this seemed prudent and Greg suggested that Honors consider advising costs etc. in their program.

Anne also noted that IPO is developing a proposal and that Reed would meet with IPO on Friday to discuss the planning process for the fee. This fee would cover new fees to track students, and to cover transfer student fees along with other exchange fees.

Anne also discussed some mandatory fees and possible suggestions regarding how they may be changed or modified to support specific student services now mostly provided by A&S, and specifically was concerned about STEP and the Writing and Math centers. Other possible fees included an Art Museum fee and additional technology fees. Suggested Anne and Greg coordinate to make sure A&S fee is not overlapping with proposed mandatory fee changes and costs are not double-counted as proposals are developed (e.g. for STEP).

Suzie updated group on education college plans for a fee. Suggested several areas of advising and professional development that would be supported, along with accreditation and assessment costs, and noted this was in line with institutional priorities – specifically the education excellence initiative.

It was decided there would be no meeting on Monday the 15th because of the number of people who would be absent – next meeting August 18th.

After the meeting Rob met Bryan Shader who informed him that there was no current plan to cover the costs of technology in the new Enzi STEM building. Given rooms in this building were considered labs assigned to specific departments they were responsible for maintenance. He has furnished a cost breakdown by department and expected costs to Rob and Greg Brown. These will have to be included in the Sci-Q fee considerations.