

All Task Force Comments Received on Tuition and Fees Working Group Recommendations and Report

November 2016

Recommendation 1: Allocate tuition and fee revenue based primarily on school of instruction.

1. Yes!
2. When students apply to college, many pick a random major and will change their major during new student orientation.
3. I agree with this recommendation.
4. seems valid
5. I served on this work group. I support this recommendation.
6. I was part of this working group and could not agree more with this recommendation.
7. I think this is a fantastic idea! Will help get H&S the \$\$ they are missing by teaching so many general education for all students. There MUST be safe guards at the course creation/approval process level against courses like "English for Engineers", "Math for Artists", etc. - taking gen eds into the specialty colleges.
8. This recommendation appears reasonable
9. Concept is good but what about dual enrollment.
10. Complete agreement.

Recommendation 2: Base the revenue calculation on the proportionate share of each enrolled student's total billed tuition charge divided by the student's total billed credit hour load (excluding courses without a tuition charge).

1. yes! Calculation should be performed on a semester-by-semester basis, not accumulated hours for an entire year. This minimizes any confusion with summer hours and tuition.
2. I agree with this recommendation.
3. seems valid
4. I support this recommendation.
5. I agree with this recommendation as I believe it is the fairest way to allocate revenue.
6. From the presentation, this seemed like a very helpful and fair way to account for revenue across units.
7. This recommendation appears reasonable
8. Too complicated.
9. Complete agreement.

Recommendation 3: For Undergraduate Students: Use BOV approved standard undergraduate tuition rate based on residency status. Allocate 100% of tuition differentials to the student's school of enrollment independently of other tuition and fee revenue.

1. Yes
2. The Tuition & Fee group is recognizing the tuition differential as guaranteed money (i.e., treated like school-based fees). The Financial Aid group assumed that tuition differentials would be considered tuition revenue. As it stands now, I believe tuition differentials are refundable if a

student withdraws outside of the add/drop window (but within the refund period), but fees are not. I think it would be best to be consistent, though I have no opinion on which way to handle tuition differentials.

3. I agree with this recommendation.
4. seems valid
5. I support this recommendation.
6. I agree with this recommendation.
7. This appears to be the best way to keep the differential with the school/unit/reason why the differential is charged.
8. This recommendation appears reasonable.
9. Do away with "tuition differentials" to make the distribution less complicated.
10. Complete agreement.

Recommendation 4: For Graduate Students: Use BOV approved standard graduate tuition rates such as Masters, Doctoral, etc. based on graduate program level and residency status.

1. Yes
2. Basically, this is automatically creating tuition differentials for any program with a higher than standard tuition. What about the programs with lower than standard tuition rates (e.g., Patient Counseling)?
3. I agree with this recommendation.
4. seems valid
5. I support this and understand that 100% of tuition differential will be allocated to the student's school of enrollment.
6. I agree with this recommendation.
7. Yes!
8. This appears reasonable. Question: Currently, there are different tuition rates between the Monroe Park Campus and the MCV campus. Would these different tuition rates remain, and become the base for allocating tuition for the respective campus students?
9. Agree
10. Complete agreement

Recommendation 5: For Professional Students: A base tuition amount, -to be determined-, should be defined for the professional students, using a fixed number of credit hours for all students.

1. Yes
2. This should clarify that it is for First-Professional programs (I would suggest listing all three specifically). Most of the programs on the MCV campus are "professional" programs. The use of the term "professional" can cause confusion for some
3. I agree with this recommendation.
4. revenue needed to train different professional students varies per profession. might not be feasible to find one base rate
5. I support this recommendation.
6. I agree with this recommendation.
7. This would be very helpful to define since so many students on VCU's medical campus fall into this category.

8. This recommendation appears reasonable, however: if the professional student programs have varying credit hour requirements and/or tuition rates, additional research may be necessary to avoid un-intended consequences.
9. Shared with dean and budget folks as well, clarification on what a "professional student" is - for the larger audience. And will a similar or different model for distributing any tuition differential be used for professional students?
10. Agree
11. This makes sense given the unique nature of these program's tuition structure.

Recommendation 6: Allocate fee revenue in accordance with the fee justification aligning fee to planned expenses. Therefore 100% of program fee revenue would be allocated to the student's school of enrollment and 100% of course fee revenue would be allocated to the school of instruction.

1. Yes
2. We might want to clarify the statement 100% of program FEE revenue would be allocated to the student's school of enrollment and 100% of course FEE revenue would be allocated to the school of instruction.
3. How does this take living-learning programs into consideration, such as Globe, LEAD, and ASPIRE that offer certificates and are open to students in all majors. Likewise, how does this take students who are members of the Honors College into consideration.
4. I agree with this recommendation.
5. seems valid
6. I support this recommendation.
7. I agree with this recommendation.
8. It would be helpful to define which fees will be allocated in this way - there are a number of academic fees, university fees, and other items that students pay that are included in the umbrella term of "fees", that would be good to see defined as line items to understand which need to be allocated to academic units vs. auxiliary units.
9. this recommendation appears reasonable.
10. Agree
11. Complete agreement

Recommendation 7: Allocate 80% of base tuition revenue to the school of instruction and 20% of base tuition revenue to the student's school of enrollment.

1. NO - I suggest a deeper review of "program codes", e.g., instruction, research, academic support, etc. to see if the 80%/20% split is valid. The underlying need to allocate 20% to the school of enrollment is to cover costs like recruiting, advising, job placement, mentoring, etc. This 80/20 split offers a clean way to provide incentives to improve academic support within the units, or at least balance teaching vs. advising. This require additional digging!!!!
2. Non-degree seeking students are housed under Humanities and Sciences but do not necessarily take classes in H&S. Maybe revenue should be allocated 100% to the teaching school.
3. The Honors College works very closely with Strategic Enrollment Management to recruit high achieving students to VCU, which ultimately help VCU's retention and graduation rate. Where is the Honors College factored into the budget model?
4. I agree with this recommendation.

5. tuition provided at 20% to non-enrolling school for professional students could become prohibitive. schools may look to hire and teach within own school
6. This is the most common national allocation and I support it.
7. After examining several different models, I believe this split is the fairest and makes the most sense for VCU.
8. This is a very fair break-down and a formula used widely across institutions with RCM budget models.
9. It is my understanding that the working group noted that additional research is necessary, to determine the school of enrollment for a student with multiple majors, a major and a minor, etc. These decisions will need to be well thought out, so as not to dissuade schools from offering options to students, in order that a school can keep a larger share of tuition revenue. (especially if the second major or minor is from a different school from the primary major.)
10. Agree with distribution.
11. Complete agreement.

General Comments:

1. One what basis does SCHEV or the general assembly allocate dollars to VCU (e.g., credit hours, student headcount, etc.?) In my experience, a state allocation is made to subsidize the cost of education for in-state students vs. the "true cost" of education, that is, the tuition charged to out-of-state students. It would be interesting to frame the in-state subsidy such that the State can see how much they're helping residents.
2. How are double majors factored into the model? What happens when a student gets close to graduation and decides to no longer pursue one of the majors? What policies will be put into place to direct student behavior as they move in and out of a major? It may be useful to look at the change of majors data. Further, there are some students in majors that are not a good fit for them academically. Will this model lead to the unintended consequence of academic advisors encouraging students to remain in a major that they would normally encourage to leave?
3. I agree with this recommendation.
4. As we look at EPTs we will need to take into consideration the variance in current arrangements. For example, some allocate 100% of new tuition to school offering the program and that entire amount is used to offset costs. If there were a central cost, it could jeopardize some programs.
5. I think the ETP agreements need to be re-set to zero to establish a level playing field across all of the units at the University.
6. Strong incentives (or conversely, penalties) need to be developed and communicated to all schools to encourage inter-school programs and collaboration. This also needs strong, active support from the Provost. Otherwise, schools will dissolve existing inter-school programs, in order to keep a larger share of tuition revenue. [The theory of un-intended consequences]
7. How will EPT's be evaluated under a new budget model? Impact to schools with 100% allocation.
8. The tuition and fee allocation proposal is well thought out however I see no proposals or working groups addressing the issue of allocation of state funding.
9. Will #6 result in a simplification/streamlining of the current fees?
10. The group did an excellent job.
11. The outstanding issues section contains a number of tricky questions for which I don't have the proper perspective to offer suggestions. That said, the question of "look forward" vs. "look back" seems to be the most fundamental issue. Given that RCM is designed to reward behaviors such as enrollment growth, it would be optimal to have a "look forward" approach to help ensure that a given school's growth in budgetary resources aligns as quickly as possible with its expanding

needs. However, it is hard to envision how this approach be could be practically implemented. So my comment is a vote for "look forward" if a reasonable solution can be devised to the challenges it presents.