

MINUTES

Agenda

Talk through tuition structure issues

Committee Members Present

Sherm Bloomer, Allison Hurst, Alison Johnston, Joanna DeMeyer, Amy Bourne, Javier Nieto, Staci Simonich, Mak Khan, Jackie Thorsness, Jessica DuPont, Mackenzie Thibault, Lisa Gaines, Michaela Canete

Committee Members Absent

Jon Boeckenstedt, John Gremmels, Kelly Sparks, Taha Elewfati, Edgar Rodriguez, Deja Preusser

Other University Staff Present

Nicole Dolan, Laurie Henry

Tuition Structure

Sherm Bloomer, Associate Vice President for Budget and Resource Planning recapped the tuition structure conversation¹ during the last UBC meeting on April 23, 2021 and continued the discussion on OSU's tuition structure with the goal of identifying any consensus on things to recommend or note for the Provost.

Recommendations/principles

- The goals of reviewing and considering changes to OSU's tuition structure are to:
 - Effectively communicate and explain tuition to stakeholders
 - Make the value of an OSU education clear and attractive
- Identifying a tuition strategy requires a discussion of OSU's near- and long-term enrollment goals, including:
 - What are enrollment goals by campus and modality and student level?
 - How do those goals map to college and program levels?
 - Given those goals, what is the "right" tuition level for each program in each area in terms of list price, discounting, market, and so on?

Committee discussion

- Consideration in recruitment strategies in identifying and understanding long-term enrollment goals
- Fairness of charges, affordability, equality—mission to serve Oregon, how do those link to an enrollment tuition strategy, who bears the cost?

¹ Tuition Structure Conversations handout:

https://fa.oregonstate.edu/sites/fa.oregonstate.edu/files/ubc_tuition_discussion_materials_5-7-21.pdf

Bloomer discussed ways to think about undergraduate base tuition charges.

- Segmenting tuition to identify a common instructional component, a component specific to support/development costs unique to Ecampus, and a component recognizing the costs of physical campus infrastructure for non-resident students who commit to a campus.
 - The idea was raised that resident Oregon students anywhere should pay the same tuition regardless of modality or location. That could be done by:
 - Charging campus students by campus rather than modality and providing a scholarship to distance resident Ecampus students equal to the Ecampus fee (roughly \$2.5M cost). This would create parity with Corvallis students using Ecampus but doesn't recognize the unique costs of Ecampus infrastructure and wouldn't necessarily change enrollment.
 - Doing away with the Ecampus "fee" component by spreading it across all credits on the argument the infrastructure is now a ubiquitous part of OSU and contributes to programs for all students. This provides a relatively clean solution but results in a large increase in rate for students on the Corvallis or Bend campuses.
 - Clarify why the tuition charge for Ecampus includes the Ecampus infrastructure charge and why it is appropriate despite creating cost differences.

Committee discussion

- Challenges in doing away with Ecampus "fee" component is a 10% increase in resident tuition in Corvallis in order to retain the same revenue.
 - Spreading out the cost across modalities; Ecampus tuition would go down and Corvallis resident student tuition would go up.
 - How to clarify why the tuition charge for Ecampus includes the Ecampus infrastructure charge and why it is appropriate for distance students and on-campus students despite creating cost differences.
 - Merging scenarios; can we keep the distance education infrastructure charge and charge it to truly full-time distance students then recalibrate the instructional fee across remaining categories bringing the instructional fee down slightly? (reference Table 1 in Tuition Structure Conversations handout)
 - Challenge; DSC coded students and discontinuity between resident students in Corvallis or Cascades who pay a lower rate for courses taken face-to-face versus taking the same course through Ecampus. Contrary, a truly distant student pays a higher rate for an Ecampus course than a student who can take a face-to-face course in Corvallis.
 - Constraints; Ecampus is priced nationally (competitively) and is positioned for affordability and quality.
 - Can we charge by campus holding Ecampus as separate entity?
 - Resident students tend to find out about Ecampus savings after being on campus.
 - A non-resident taking on-campus or an Ecampus course should pay the full fee but residents should pay a fee offset by state.

Bloomer discussed support from the UBC and Student Budget Advisory Council on the idea of a supplemental tuition charge for non-resident students who choose to attend a physical campus (i.e. charging by campus and residency more than by modality).

Committee discussion

- Functionally, no matter what modality a non-resident student chose they would pay the supplemental tuition charge. This would make the cost the same regardless of modality.

Bloomer continued the discussion regarding OSU's change from an undergraduate tuition plateau to per credit hour charges in 2016.

Committee discussion

- Is it worth revisiting the decision to step away from a tuition plateau model?
 - The [Student Budget Advisory Council \(SBAC\)](#) was in favor of the plateau model; they felt it would allow them to take classes that they wouldn't normally take (i.e. Japanese, Yoga); the council also suggested having the plateau start at 15 credit hours versus 12.
 - Consensus seemed to lean positive towards a plateau starting at 15 credit hours.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:26 p.m. by Sherm Bloomer. Next meeting will be held May 28, 2021 from 2:00 – 3:30 p.m. via Zoom.