University Budget Committee Meeting Agenda
Friday, April 19, 2024
B011 Kerr Admin. Bldg. and Zoom

MINUTES


Committee Members Absent: John Gremmels, Terri Libert, Tania Davis, Rashed Sayedshareef

University Staff Present: Brent Gustafson, Kayla Campbell, Mealoha McFadden, Erica Dodson

1. Discussion of campus-based tuition
   a. Tuition charged by manner in which course is delivered. Has implications to Ecampus. Ecampus pricing is higher than resident tuition but lower than non-resident tuition. So when a resident student is taking an Ecampus course, it would cost more than if they were taking it in the Corvallis classroom. However, a non-resident student would pay less by taking an Ecampus course.
   b. Increasing use of Ecampus by campus students creates unintended cost and revenue issues (more expensive for residents, less expensive for non-residents)
   c. Charging by campus distributes costs as intended in the tuition structure and is modestly positive overall.
   d. Comments:
      i. Jessica – Some of the recommendations are worth reviewing. New SRBM doesn’t incentivize DSC courses. Equity piece is huge since they are paying more. Unknown is that don’t know if campus non-resident students will continue taking online courses if costs change. Involve colleges and course schedulers into this conversation, as Ecampus students are not able to take courses because campus students have already registered for the Ecampus courses.
      ii. Jon – Need to account for athletic scholarships cost structure who are taking 100% online courses. Model shown assumes behavior doesn’t change and revenue assumptions need to be tempered. Need to classify student’s campus status since students can change their campus code without any oversight. Pitch flexibility and freedom with weird exceptions on how to take courses. Take the One OSU approach so that there is no distinction amongst the three campuses but need to operationalize that. There is a concern that students are forced into Ecampus as there’s not campus course availability.
iii. Marc – Ask Colleges to restrict ecampus access to campus students. Can we have two Ecampus rates? Per Jessica, from a marketing standpoint, that wouldn’t be good for Ecampus since other institutions are also only offering one rate. Ecampus enrollment would plummet in non-resident Ecampus enrollment. A lot of discounting through waivers make a difference to sticker price.

iv. Jeff – Likes the simplicity and predictability for students. Since the SRBM is changing, it’d be good to proceed with this change. This changed would effectively reduce cost for

v. Joe – Thinks it is a cash grab from non-resident students if Ecampus rates increase for non-residents. Doesn’t like this idea. Resident students charged $100 more but non-resident $300 less for the same course. Ecampus courses provide flexibility.

vi. Steve – Has Joe, as an out of state student, taken classes to take advantage of cost savings? Joe - Haven't had a choice because of course availability and to graduate in 3 years.

vii. Jessica – Good feedback for colleges to hear that there are major capacity issues for on campus courses that force the students to take Ecampus courses. If students are expected to graduate in 4 years, then really need to look at this.

viii. Brent – What principles do we want to apply? What structure should we apply?

ix. Carissa – Has chosen to take campus courses for the college experience, likes the flexibility

x. Jeff - What would revenue impact be for Corvallis students to pay Corvallis rates for Ecampus and Non-residents pay Ecampus rates?

xi. Brent and Kayla – Would need to do an analysis.

2. Recommendation:
   a. Tuition charges should move to a charge-by-student campus code approach for all students instead of charging by course campus/modality.
   b. This should be phased in by undergraduate cohorts (so current students would continue under the current structure but new students would be charged in the new structure). The change for graduate students should be made at the same time as the change for the first undergraduate cohort in the new system.

3. Advantages
   a. Removes cost increase when resident campus students want to use an Ecampus course
   b. Appropriately recovers non-resident tuition costs from students taking courses on campus
   c. Addresses the added cost of using Ecampus courses for graduate students in programs with a tuition plateau
   d. Disadvantages—increases costs for non-resident students on campus who use Ecampus as part of their programs
4. Caveats
   a. Establish clear criteria for the use of campus-based courses by DSC coded students. This could be a limit on the number of courses or credits per time period or per total credit hours or by advisor override approvals. A commitment to resources necessary to monitor any such criteria will be necessary.
      i. Jessica – Shouldn't limit students to allow for flexibility. There aren’t a lot of students currently making campus code changes.
      ii. Marc – More about how a DSC student taking more campus courses than the reverse.
      iii. Shaun – Limits the number of campus code switches.
   b. Short, clear communications should be made for students on how to change campuses and the consequences of such a change. A similar communication should be crafted for advisors to explain why this change is being made and when it is appropriate for a student to make such a campus change.
   c. Summer session (which does not have a resident/non-resident tuition distinction and is typically part-time study) would continue to be charged by course campus as it is now. Summer charges would not change for any courses (Corvallis, Cascades, or Ecampus).
   d. Discussions on implementation needs and consequences should include Financial Aid, General Counsel, Enrollment Management, Academic Affairs, Bursar’s Office, Registrar’s Office, head advisors, and ASOSU and ASCC.
   e. A small workgroup should be charged to lead these discussions on implementation and prepare communication materials about this change.
5. Other comments:
   a. With Graduate rates, how do we think about PWS goal and how
   b. Shaun - Because of the lack of a plateau on Ecampus courses, then it costs more above a certain number of credits for Grad Assistants. Costs are absorbed by grants or by E&G funding.
   c. Kayla – Unexpected costs with GRAD costs that cause unpredictability for college.
   d. Jessica - Banner code applied at time of admission. But switching campuses is something they may learn through advisors. Fees are embedded into the Ecampus rates.
   e. How much does state funding factor in for per student costs? Greater amount of institutional waivers helps offset things. If there is no longer that equilibrium between in and out of state pricing, if that construct is no longer, than need to assess.
   f. Thomas – Non-resident student taking Ecampus courses since freshman year and entire minor is Ecampus. Whole majors at Cascades where courses are offered only through Ecampus. Decreasing out of state costs would be beneficial for non-resident enrollment. If there is no longer an equilibrium construct, then there is a concern for the non-resident costs. Forced to take Ecampus courses.
   g. Tom – Disincentivizing to take online courses to save money but there are courses only available online. Shouldn’t be paying a higher rate for residents since that isn’t fair. For non-residents, maybe given a waiver so they don’t seem disenfranchised and comments raised by students should really be considered.
   h. Jeff – What is the asymmetry/equilibrium issue? Heard a lot from these students about being forced to take these courses. Is there a potential middle ground?
6. What should next steps be?
a. Jon – Concrete, comprehensive proposal – put forth recommendations that includes what’s been discussed up to this point. Reasonable so people can react to something concrete. Shaun and Nicole agree.

b. Jessica – What is the revenue gain in doing this? If it’s a wash, then maybe we don’t do this. Would appreciate more discussing by pulling in stakeholders discussed more with this model.

c. **Follow up**: Data on construct of non-resident tuition making up costs of resident students.

d. **Follow up**: Data on revenue gain to know if this adjustment is worth it.

e. Kayla – Consider AMP implementation timing with this work.

f. **Follow up** – Get stakeholders together to gain perspectives.