

Minutes - Revenue Enhancement Committee

August 8, 9:00 am Tobin Rm, Knight Hall

Agenda

Primary purpose – Develop fee proposals by area

- Update – Trustees feedback.
- Discuss approach developing proposed fees
 - o Data collected since last meeting – some changes though not many
- Continued work on questions for committee from last meetings:
 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?
- Question – change meeting time to accommodate Anne?
- Other?

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

Attending: Michael Pishko, Denise Gable, Reed Scull, Gerry Andrews, John Mittelstaedt, Suzie Young, Ricki Klages, Rob Godby, Greg Brown

Absent: Anne Alexander, Susan Frye, Mary Burman

Rob opened the meeting with a report of the Trustees' retreat in Saratoga. Noted that legislators spoke to the Trustees the day before his presentation and message was bad – Phil Nicholas reported that the state has made cuts of 8% but the budget hole may be closer to 14%. Implication – more cuts are likely. This makes our revenues more important than ever as a buffer against larger effects. Also the update from the President was that she expects about 400 fewer positions at UW when all cut-backs planned are realized and implemented. Discussion in halls that if additional cuts occur this could climb to 600. At 400 reductions, tenure may not have to be broken but at 600 this becomes more likely. Trustees appear frustrated at the fact that workload changes are not occurring quickly enough and wanted to know why. The \$2.5 million anticipated from these actions has captured only \$1.2 million to date.

Trustees are not happy deans are bridge-funding out of Section 2 monies part time faculty I the coming year.

Report on the reception of our work was much better. Trustee Marsh noted one of his children pays higher differential tuition where they attend. Trustee True asked what sort of additional revenue this effort could raise – Rob noted with caution \$3-5 million new revenues would not be unreasonable, depending on final plan. Rob also noted Trustees would like the plan sooner than later so they can see how it will fit with the FCAC plan and any new cuts that could occur in October with the new CREG report. Rob indicated to the Trustees he was willing to get a preliminary report to them As soon as possible and timeline may have to move up on our work to a due date of October.

Rob noted comparative data on institutional support of various areas from Huron and that UW was well below peers in important areas like research. See Huron Handout.

ASUW President Rotellini noted support for the concept of program fees and noted that Senate Resolution 2494 supported such efforts. I have since checked the ASUW website though and found that the resolution was to oppose support for differential tuition, which failed 7-16 on March 22/2016 (thus the ASUW supported differential tuition). http://www.uwyo.edu/asuw/files/legislation/2015-2016%20pdf%20files/senate%20resolution%202494_failed.pdf

Important take-away – Trustees appear in favor of our work, especially given there may be more cuts coming. Some students are also supportive.

Rob noted Anne is working on an Honors proposals and also an International Programs proposal, as well as some changes to mandatory fees. She could not attend due to a meeting with Provost Miller. Discussion regarding proposals – and deadlines – draft proposals from areas should be ready no later than August 22nd so that Rob can create a report and the group can deal with issues across proposals not already discussed.

Some discussion about whether a Sci-Q fee should be tied to recognize different cost basis of various programs. Idea suggested was a three tier system – e.g. tier 1: quantitative with lowest credit hour fee, for possibly Math, Stats Psychology and Anthropology since most classes do not require additional facility or materials, Tier 2, an intermediate one for sciences that are higher cost than tier 1 and include labs and field work, and finally tier 3 with significant facility and equipment cost such as Chemistry/Physics etc.

Some discussion of how fees would be assessed to cross-listed courses – fees could go to delivering department and be assessed the fee that delivering department assesses in if the cross-list is with a program that had a different program fee cost. Also – Rob will provide credit hours by course codes once identified course codes are known from the Uber report.

It was decided that John and Suzie's proposals could provide a template others could use as a guide.

Questions regarding how fees are assessed in combination, how cross-lists and other issues are dealt with will have to be determined by the committee but such issues cannot be identified until we know what sort of basic fees we are considering.

Noted in addition to proposals we also have to develop a business plan of how fees will be distributed and used to ensure/improve instructional services and support as well as programs.

Reed presented his thoughts on an Outreach fee including the comparator institutions Outreach feels are important to note. He noted a \$35/cr hr. fee would seem reasonable – this would be a \$10 increase. Some discussion regarding how fees are assessed across programs and impacts on resident and non-resident students, and how non-resident and resident tuitions are now handled.

Rob noted that some additional policies will have to be drafted by the institution that we will have to identify such as salary policies, Program fee rules and practices including rules for program fee changes, or reserve account policies if departments begin to deliver programs and become revenue centers through fees generated. While we are only responsible for a fee proposal it is likely there will have to be other policies drafted to deal with areas these fees affect.

Decision to move Monday meetings to 1:00-2:30 pm to accommodate Anne Alexander who now has a standing meeting conflict. They will now be held then in OM 321.

Final note – we now have our own public committee website where our minutes are posted.

http://webdev.uwyo.edu/president/budget_planning/rec/

Meeting adjourned at 10:40 am.