The draft tuition setting process document reviewed and discussed by the Committee on November 18, 2010, has been amended. The revised version is attached and the changes are highlighted in the text. Many of the changes are merely clarifications and expansions of the previous draft and do not represent any substantive adjustments to it. However, a few changes reflect new developments and warrant separate consideration.

1. On page 2, at the bottom of the page, is language noting that the process is consistent with the current Board policy on Student Shared Governance. In addition, language has been added to specify that differential tuition is expected (also in conformance with current Board tuition policy).

2. On page 3, under section 1 of the process, at line 4, is the language “…suggestions from other state education boards.” This reflects the possibility of a statewide education or higher education coordinating council, a feature of the current draft of the Higher Education Work Group draft legislation.

3. Page 3, section 1, also adds the availability of student financial aid as a factor in the development of the Board’s tuition guidance. This had been included in Committee discussions in November but had been inadvertently omitted from the actual language of prior drafts.

4. Page 3, section 1, also is the place that a statement has been added to the effect that those elements of tuition that do not support Education and General activities (e.g., student building fee, health fee, student incidental fee, and matriculation fee) are not covered by the process.

5. A new sentence has been added to page 3, section 2 to reflect the addition of differential tuition to the process and the fact that both cost and market factors could be among the reasons for a possible differential.

6. At page 4, section 5, sentences have been added to call for the distribution of campus proposals to Board members (as requested at the November Committee meeting) and to cognizant state bodies (a nod to the possibility of a Coordinating Council). Also, based on the November Committee discussion, a sentence has been added calling on the Chancellor to attempt to reconcile a campus proposal with both Board guidance and with student comments.

7. At page 4, section 6, the consideration of tuition by the Board has been advanced from June to May (although the decision remains in June). The new draft says that either the
Board or a Committee of the Board would consider the tuition proposals and student comments. The Committee might choose at its December 16 meeting whether this would be done by the full Board or by a Committee. As noted last month, full Board consideration would require adding another meeting to each year’s calendar.

8. At page 4, section 7, the draft has been amended to call for the Board to consider suggestions from other state education bodies (e.g., the Coordinating Council). In addition, it now states that all tuition not covered by the process (e.g., graduate or nonresident undergraduate) would be approved at the same time as would tuition for students covered by the process.

The principal decision for the Committee is whether to adopt this policy. Further, the Committee might decide whether the May discussion of tuition would be held in the full Board or in a Committee.