

MINUTES

Committee members in attendance: Jessica DuPont, Shaun Bromagem, Frank Chaplen, Zackery Allen, Nicole von Germeten, Tim Carroll, Terri Libert, Joe Page, Muhammad Aatir Khan, John Gremmels, Alison Johnston, Staci Simonich

Absent committee members: Aiman Khan, Lily Butler, Lisa Gaines, Jon Boeckenstedt

Staff in attendance: Sherm Bloomer, Nicci Dolan, Kayla Campbell, Keahi McFadden

1. Review workplan for rest of the year
 - a. University Budget Committee 2021-22: Preliminary work plan
 - b. Holidays in green, breaks in grey, board meetings in tan shading.
 - c. All meetings in Covell 117 in person and via Zoom
 - i. Forecast – is different. Down \$3-5M negative. The president may go up half a percent.
 - ii. Tim: Considering half point adjustment. How much would it cover? Half % is only 1M.
 1. Can we get rid of course fees?
 2. Not a giant change of change to students. ETC.
 3. What is right for continuing students?
 - d.

Date	Topics	Tasks
Friday, March 4, 2022	Course fees, differential tuition	Review discussions of workgroups
Finals Week (3/14-3/18)		
Spring Break (3/19-3/27)		
Friday, April 1, 2022	Course fees— Budget model discussions and ideas for change	Discuss preliminary workgroup recommendations for course fees and differential tuition guideline revisions Summarize workgroup discussions, consider ideas to address issues
BoT (Apr 7-8)		Present and seek approval on tuition and fee proposal
Friday, April 15, 2022	Non-resident charges, Differential tuition, course fee recommendations	Discuss preliminary workgroup recommendations for differential tuition guideline revisions Revisit Corvallis non-resident charges, areas for recommendation to Provost?
Friday, April 29, 2022	Budget model change proposals	Discussion, points of concern, missing pieces. These are to be implemented 2023-24
Friday, May 13, 2022	Course fees and differential tuition review draft report to Provost	Review final proposals for recommendations to the Provost revisions to existing guidelines
BoT (May 26-27)		
Memorial Day (May 30)		

	Review Final report to Provost; discuss Budget Model proposed changes	Review report, finalize any edits, approve
Friday, June 3, 2022		
Shavuot (June 5-6)		

2. Review discussions of course fee workgroup and consider paths forward.
 - a. Smallest course fee is \$2.
 - b. Very important to instructors.
 - c. Should we do what Tim suggest – Tweak tuition to roll course fees into budget? Colleges would be responsible to support items previously covered by course fees which are mostly experiential learning things.
 - d. Colleges would have to think about deploying budget for these types of activities.
 - e. College of Ag Sciences thinks they can't update course fees. If we went right now, start a process to clean up course fees.
 - i. How would we calibrate this appropriately? Would look at all resources.
 - f. Alison: Talk to the Deans. Directly effected of course fees.
 - g. Shaun: Materiality makes sense.
 - h. Mak- How specific do we want to be? Charge course fees for courses with higher cost. Cover but balance impact that is low. The more you spread it on a broader level. Is this a negative for differential?
 - i. Frank: Appreciate Mak and supports his comments and thoughts.
 - j. Zack: Like to hear more about this for differential tuition.
 - i. Some things that might be more important. Not punish the individual departments. Too granular for differential tuition.
 - k. Course fees are very finely segmented version at the individual course level.
3. Review discussions of differential tuition workgroup and consider paths forward.
 - a. Discuss differential tuition proposal from Ag Sciences relative to workgroup ideas.
 - b. Tuition tables are complicated.
 - c. What do we want our tuition structure to look like?
 - d. Be able to explain to stakeholders.
 - e. What do we want our enrollment to look like? We can then think about the pricing strategy for the mix of students we want.
 - f. Jon: Colleges & Central – charge space in buildings or classroom usage? We do not charge (exceptions for buildings off campus sometimes or wavelab), but mostly not.
 - i. Get granular in cost – space costs more to teach in nicer/popular/better buildings

- ii. Sherm: Costing programs is really challenging. Instructors have mixed duties. Buildings have different costs. High level we know. The finer part gets really hard. We have gone too far to the granularity. Students might have a higher-level side.
- iii. Allison: cost opportunity class size, instructor, and differential all need to be considered.
- iv. Sherm: if try to maximize the college size then no one will enroll, and students will fail.
- v. Allison: Psychology – didn't choose to go that way. Budget model constrained.
- vi. Frank: Can complete size of classes. There are only so many workshops, lab benches, machine shops, etc. There is a distinct limitation. Engineering costs more– infrastructure limitations mapping to faculty time.
- vii. Operations is out of tuition & state dollars.
- viii. Frank: Learning innovation center – people want to be there.
- ix. Sherm: Allison brought up a good question. Perceived incentives, easier to see.
- g. Tim: Scale course fees – find way to balance between course fees and differential. Cost of administrating this would be a longer-term issue. Suggest a holistic view on a pricing strategy that makes sense.
- h. Frank: asking for differential tuition is continual funding. Maybe one-off funding. Thinking in terms of proposals for a differential charge. Proposer – how are things currently funded and why differential funding is currently funding. Discussions like that in the proposal would be great.
 - i. Sherm: Not uncommon for colleges to start with foundation or grant funding. Then get at the end of it and need to try to get this good thing going. Plus, up money to keep this thing going.
- i. Give advice back to the provost.
 - i. Review the guidelines. Might want to have a longer conversation and think about revisiting overall strategy. All colleges have different prices.
 - ii. Terri: What is the foundational philosophy on pricing? Cost, market, value, blended, etc.? Sherm: We don't have one pricing strategy. Ecampus is market for growth. Other prices have developed over a variety of reasons.
 - 1. Jon: Don't know, its incrementalism.
 - 2. Sherm: Average discounting at private
 - 3. Jon – 60%. Highest 4yr private is 86%.

- iii. Jessica: What would you do? DT – it is complex. Interwoven with pricing strategy. Bigger pricing strategy. At an interesting crossroads, maybe have a consultant, in house or external, take a look.
 - 1. Tuition tables: look at this from the student experience.
Complicated to navigate the public facing material. How do we explain it in a simplified way in communications and address affordability.
 - 2. How does this affect brand perception of OSU?
- iv. Frank: Wrap up course fees if we want the differential tuition.