

---

---

**Docket Item:**

Public University Tuition and Mandatory Enrollment Fee Increase Review Student Survey and Responses

**Docket Material:**

As part of the HECC's review of tuition increases of greater than 5%, the Commission requested that staff contact students at each of the impacted campuses in order to garner a student perspective on the tuition and fee-setting process.

As part of this process, staff selected two students from each of the five impacted institutions to contact based on two criteria:

1. At least one of the two selected students shall have participated in the institution's tuition advisory committee. Where possible, staff tried to contact the lead student representative from each institution.
2. The other student shall be the President of the institution's recognized student government.

These criteria were selected in order to allow for responses by students who were thought to be in the best position to speak on behalf of their fellow students as to how the tuition-setting process was perceived by the student body of each institution. HECC Commissioner McMorris assisted with the student selection process. HECC staff also received assistance from the Oregon Student Association in contacting the identified students.

Staff sent the survey to each student and then followed up with e-mails and phone calls for those students who did not respond. The result was that at least one of the students from every campus responded. The questions that were asked are included below and the responses are included with each institution's respective docket packet.

**Questions Asked:**

The survey consisted of three questions as follows:

**Question 1:** The following is how each institution described the tuition setting process in terms of student involvement (Quoted from their board docket on tuition increases). Does this match your experience and, if not, why not? (Institutional process descriptions are located below question 3)

**Question 2:** How otherwise did your institution or yourself reach out to solicit student input? How was any input communicated as part of the tuition recommendation?

**Question 3:** What impact did student comments have on the final recommendation? Do you feel that the institution, board and staff were responsive to student concerns?

**Institutional Process Descriptions for Question 1:**

**OIT:** “The Tuition Recommendation Committee (TRC), comprised of students, faculty and staff met five times, beginning in January and concluding with public forums on both the Klamath Falls and Wilsonville campuses in early April to consider tuition rates for 2017-18 Academic year. The TRC was provided with financial projections, current tuition and fee rates at other Oregon public universities and other information as background materials.

The Tuition Recommendation Committee established a set of guiding principles. These were reviewed by the Finance and Facilities Committee at its regular meeting on February 23, 2017 and by the then Interim President and President-Designate. The Guiding Principles and Process Requirements are as follows; Guiding Principles:

- Tuition levels should have a solid rationale and justification
- Tuition shall be appropriate to ensure that quality is maintained in all academic and support programs, thus assuring an excellent return on investment for our students and their families
- The committee shall ensure that they communicate openly and transparently with all stakeholders
- Tuition levels shall be appropriate to support the long-term financial stability of the institution and in alignment with its mission, vision and values
- We will strive to reduce complexity in the tuition structure where possible

Process Requirements:

- The Committee will use data and comparisons to other peer institutions
- The Committee will understand the institution’s overall budget and significant cost drivers, including which expenses and revenues are within the institution’s control
- The Committee will be open to and respectful of dialogue, constructive criticism and feedback
- The Committee will strive to create conditions for real and substantive feedback from all campus constituencies including students, faculty and staff”

**PSU:** “Portland State University engages in a collaborative tuition setting process with guidance provided by the Student Budget Advisory Committee (SBAC), which includes students, staff, and faculty members. For the 2017-2018 fiscal year, the following members of the committee met five times from January to March 2017 to consider the direction the university should take on tuition and fees: Donald Thompson, III, student; Linh Le, student; Jose Rojas Fallas, student; Kevin Reynolds, Finance & Administration; Andria Johnson, Finance & Administration; Cliff Allen, School of

Business Administration; Gerardo Lafferriere, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences; Gil Miller, Academic Affairs; and Kati Falger, Finance & Administration. The committee reviewed the university's financial condition and forecasts that considered likely enrollment trends and potential state funding scenarios.

Additionally, the President and members of the university's executive leadership team have hosted, attended, and presented at numerous internal and external events to explore the budgetary challenges confronting Portland State. These have given members of the community and external partners the opportunity to provide us with input and have included meetings and presentations for the following groups: Board of Trustees' Finance and Administration committee; Academic Affairs winter budget forum; State of Oregon legislature's House Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee; Funding and Achievement Committee of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission; Portland State University Foundation board; the university's Academic Leadership Team (ALT); ASPSU Student Senate; and, a university-wide budget forum for faculty, staff, and students. “

**SOU:** “The Tuition Advisory Council (TAC), composed of three administrators, two faculty members and four students, and is chaired by the provost, began meeting in February. The Council reviewed SOU's tuition history and market placement, in Oregon as well as neighboring states. Members also reviewed in detail the financial pro forma that projected SOU's financial picture through the next two biennia. Several tuition rate scenarios were run through the pro forma to inform the TAC; market elasticity modeling was used to consider the impact on enrollment based on each scenario. The TAC drafted its proposal and presented it for feedback to the Associated Students of SOU, ASSOU Senate, Faculty Senate, SOU Budget Committee, University Planning Board, the Executive Council and the President's Cabinet. After reviewing the feedback, the TAC made its formal proposal to President Schott.

The director of the Student Health and Wellness Center works with the Budget Department to review operational costs and revenue projections to determine the (Health Center) fee for the following year. This fee recommendation was presented to the same campus constituent groups at the same time as the tuition rates and all fees, to get feedback and to help finalize a recommendation to the SOU President.”

**UO:** “The Tuition and Fee Advisory Board (TFAB) exists to advise the provost on tuition, mandatory fees, course fees, other significant costs of education (e.g., housing fees), as well as issues related to tuition structure (e.g., differential tuition, guaranteed tuition). TFAB does not vote on a specific recommendation; its chairs take all advice and feedback into consideration and a generalized TFAB recommendation is submitted to the provost. The provost confers with the president, they put forth a recommendation for public comment, and then the president forwards a final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

The TFAB is co-chaired by Jamie Moffitt, vice president for finance and administration and CFO, and Brad Shelton, senior vice provost for budget and strategic planning. Its membership includes

five students(one graduate and four undergraduate), faculty, deans, vice presidents, vice provosts, and other administrative staff engaged in budgeting, institutional research and financial aid.

TFAB met seven times during November through February. TFAB meetings were open to the public and materials were posted on the Institutional Research website. In addition to TFAB meetings, TFAB held a student forum in January and ASUO held an additional forum in February, with three trustees, as well as the co-chairs of TFAB, during which students could learn more about the tuition setting-process, ask questions and offer input. “

**WOU:** “The purpose of the Student Tuition Advisory Committee is to provide an opportunity for students to become familiar with university finances and provide meaningful feedback prior to the University formally submitting proposed tuition rates to the Board of Trustees and then to the Higher Education Coordinating Commission. The Student Tuition Advisory Committee consists of members from the student government (ASWOU), members from the Incidental Fee Committee, and WOU administrators. All meetings are open to any WOU enrolled student that wishes to attend. Meeting announcements began with the early November joint staff meeting Presidents staff / ASWOU announced 11/9/2017.

First of nine meetings began 11/14/2017. Included two open forums one of which was hosted by President Fuller. Additional presenters included Danna Richardson – Executive Director of Council of Presidents and Dave McDonald – Vice Provost for Enrollment Management.

Meeting materials and minutes are available on the committee website:

<http://www.wou.edu/financeandadministration/tuition-advisory-committee/>”

**Staff Recommendation:**

None specific to this summary, informational only.