

MINUTES

Agenda

1. Follow-up: questions or comments on the tuition recommendations.
2. Discussion on the structure of tuition, a working conversation.
3. Work plan proposal for the next few meetings.

Committee Members Present

Allison Hurst, Sherm Bloomer, Jackie Thorsness, Alison Johnston, Lisa Gaines, Amy Bourne, Jessica Dupont, Kelly Sparks, Jon Boeckenstedt, Javier Nieto, John Gremmels, Mackenzie Thibault, Staci Simonich, David Park, Deja Preusser

Committee Members Absent

Joanna DeMeyer, Michaela Canete, Taha Elewfati, Edgar Rodriguez

University Staff Present

Nicole Dolan, Laurie Henry

1. Follow-up: questions or comments on the tuition recommendations

Sherm Bloomer, Associate Vice President for Budget and Resource Planning initiated follow-up with the committee regarding any questions or comments in relation to the tuition recommendation. Kelly Sparks, Associate Vice President for Finance and Strategic Planning at OSU-Cascades provided an update regarding the OSU-Cascades fee increase. The fee increase will be 8% and includes the future services of the Student Success Center.

No other questions or comments were presented by the committee.

2. Discussion on the structure of tuition, a working conversation

Bloomer provided an update on tuition forums and informed the committee that President Alexander will likely make his recommendation the second week of March in preparation of the April Board of Trustees meeting.

Allison Hurst, UBC Chair and Associate Professor, School of Public Policy briefed the committee on next steps to utilize remaining meetings of UBC to discuss (1) the tuition structure, and (2) the budget model.

Tuition Structure Discussion – looking at resident versus non-resident undergraduate tuition for Corvallis and Ecampus. Should modality of instruction drive the tuition rate or should it be driven by where the student is situated?

- Hurst added that an Oregon resident living in Corvallis, taking courses on campus who then decides to take Ecampus courses incurs higher costs for the Ecampus course versus a non-resident student that comes to Corvallis and decides to take an Ecampus course and pays less for the Ecampus course. Students often complain about this discrepancy and view it as an inequity but are unaware that Ecampus is a separate entity.



- Jessica Dupont, Executive Director of Market Development and Student Experience- Ecampus added context from Ecampus perspective—Ecampus was set up for an audience of exclusively distanced students who did not reside on campus.
- Ecampus has a single price because when it was built it was targeted to students who were truly at a distance. The Ecampus tuition is structured to cover the cost of instruction, the cost of the Ecampus infrastructure and some of the back ended service support costs.
- Sparks added that for some programs at OSU-Cascades, Ecampus courses have become essential for students to remain on course for graduation for their major or minor.

Brainstorming session

Change to campus based charges:

Other	Pros	Cons
What are proportions of Corvallis students in Ecampus courses	Easier to calculate cost and more predictable	Potential loss of non-resident enrollment
Students feel like getting much less out of online than in person	Easier to calculate cost and aid?	Impact on continuing students more than new students likely
Modality isn't critical, the service and experience is what matters	Diminishes confusion about rate differences across modalities	Potential loss of revenue depending on balance of numbers vs rate
Can/should/how is cost linked to rates?	Allows for decisions based on modality rather than cost	Any change is advantageous to some and disadvantageous to others (a buffer is possible in transition but is expensive)
Campus recruiting isn't highlighting Ecampus and Ecampus focuses on fully online		Will it discourage department from participating in Ecampus delivery?
Strive for clarity and transparency if we started from scratch		
Data on resident/non-resident split for Bend and Corvallis		

Change to plateau charge:

Other	Pros	Cons
	Encourages timely completion	It may be too soon
	Easier for financial aid packaging	Revenue consequences overall
Probably not a recruiting barrier	Can load up on credits to a certain level—take maximum every term can reduce time to completion	Potential cost increases to individual



Aggregate revenues have to cover cost of quality programs	Would remove need for the zero credit workaround and put focus on student need vs cost	Work/obligations may mean you can take advantage of the plateau
		Probably impacts how differential tuition is calculated

3. Work plan proposal for the next few meetings

The committee will plan to continue the tuition structure discussion every other meeting. A meeting will be added to the current schedule on March 19. The committee will look at historical data, trends and analysis on different tuition structures.

- Analysis of the financial impact to Ecampus
- Quick analysis of what a change to a plateau charge might look like
- Data specific to OSU-Cascades
- How did the change adversely impact timely completion?
- Incidental fee impact

Tentative work plan for future meetings

March 5th: discuss the university budget model: provide some basic history (when it went into effect, how it was staggered into being), its aims/goals, how it works. Solicit questions and concerns and, specifically, ask what data would be helpful in future meetings.

March 19th: bring back data or materials requested on Feb 19th and continue the tuition discussion.

April 9th: bring back the data requested on March 5th and discuss areas that need attention, adjustment, or addition.

4. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m. by Sherm Bloomer. Next meeting will be held March 5, 2021 from 2:00 – 3:30 p.m. via Zoom.